



B  
STAT. HALL USE ONLY

No. 7335-4A25

v. 1



FROM THE  
FRANK CLEMENT FUND

FN 978; 4.22.40: 300





73  
13351 4  
v.7  
4/11/44

# INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

---

## HEARINGS BEFORE A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION ON **H. Res. 282**

TO INVESTIGATE (1) THE EXTENT, CHARACTER, AND OBJECTS OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, (2) THE DIFFUSION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES OF SUBVERSIVE AND UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA THAT IS INSTIGATED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES OR OF A DOMESTIC ORIGIN AND ATTACKS THE PRINCIPLE OF THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT AS GUARANTEED BY OUR CONSTITUTION, AND (3) ALL OTHER QUESTIONS IN RELATION THERETO THAT WOULD AID CONGRESS IN ANY NECESSARY REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

---

### VOLUME 7

SEPTEMBER 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, AND 13, 1939  
AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

---

Printed for the use of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1940

9815  
10



# INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

---

---

## HEARINGS BEFORE A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION ON **H. Res. 282**

TO INVESTIGATE (1) THE EXTENT, CHARACTER, AND OBJECTS OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, (2) THE DIFFUSION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES OF SUBVERSIVE AND UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA THAT IS INSTIGATED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES OR OF A DOMESTIC ORIGIN AND ATTACKS THE PRINCIPLE OF THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT AS GUARANTEED BY OUR CONSTITUTION, AND (3) ALL OTHER QUESTIONS IN RELATION THERETO THAT WOULD AID CONGRESS IN ANY NECESSARY REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

---

### VOLUME 7

SEPTEMBER 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, AND 13, 1939  
AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

---

Printed for the use of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1940

8-7  
Clement  
Feb 4, 1940  
T

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

MARTIN DIES, Texas, *Chairman*

JOHN J. DEMPSEY, New Mexico

JOE STARNES, Alabama

JERRY VOORHIS, California

JOSEPH E. CASEY, Massachusetts

NOAH M. MASON, Illinois

J. PARRELL THOMAS, New Jersey

ROBERT E. STRIPLING, *Secretary*

RHEA WHITLEY, *Counsel*

J. B. MATTHEWS, *Director of Research*

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Brodsky, Joseph, attorney, New York-----	4492
Browder, Earl Russell, secretary, Communist Party of United States-----	4275
Browder, William E., state treasurer, Communist Party of New York-----	4810
Gitlow, Benjamin, former general secretary of Communist Party of United States-----	4529
Kuntz, Ed, attorney representing W. E. Browder-----	4810
Marwig, Carl, accountant for Special Committee on Un-American Activities-----	4831
Trachtenberg, Alexander, secretary and treasurer, International Publishers-----	4863
Weiner, Robert William, financial secretary of Communist Party of United States-----	4747



# INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

---

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1939

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE  
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Who is the witness this morning, Mr. Whitley?

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Earl Browder.

## TESTIMONY OF EARL RUSSELL BROWDER, SECRETARY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

(The witness was sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that our procedure will be that our counsel, Mr. Whitley, will first question the witness, and then Mr. Matthews will also ask some questions, following Mr. Whitley's questions. Then if members of the committee have some pertinent questions they desire to ask during the course of the hearing, if they will address the Chair and state they desire to interrupt the questioning for that purpose, the Chair will accord them the privilege of asking questions in connection with the matter as to which the witness is being questioned. It is preferable, however, for members to wait until the questioning of witnesses by committee counsel is completed, after which members may ask such questions as they desire.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your full name?

Mr. BROWDER. Earl Russell Browder.

The CHAIRMAN. It is our purpose to be entirely fair to you, and at the same time we want you to make your answers responsive, so we can get some place. Witnesses are entitled to and will receive fair treatment, and, in turn, we expect them to be courteous to the committee and make their answers responsive. Then, if a witness has an explanation that is pertinent to the question, an explanation will be in order, if it is pertinent to the particular matter under consideration.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, have you ever gone under and been known by any other name?

Mr. BROWDER. I have been known by other names years ago; I have used different pen names in writings, and so on, but in all my ordinary life I have been known by the name of Earl Browder.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other names have you been known by, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I have been under the name of Ward and Dixon in various writings and conferences.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are those names, Ward and Dixon, which you have used, what are known as party names?

Mr. BROWDER. No; nom de plumes, for the purpose of writing.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have only used them for the purpose of writing?

Mr. BROWDER. And so on.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have not used them for the purpose of identification by the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I have been addressed by those names at times many years ago.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is it the general practice of the Communist Party for its members to use aliases or assumed names?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not.

Mr. WHITLEY. And there is no such thing as a party name?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is, no name other than the actual name of the person or the member?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. There is no such practice in your party?

Mr. BROWDER. No such practice.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you state the occasions on which you have used those names—Dixon and Ward?

Mr. BROWDER. Around 1921 and 1922, at the time there was in existence what was called the underground Communist Party, that is, the Communist Party that did not maintain open headquarters and open publications.

Mr. WHITLEY. Were you known to the other officers and members of the party in this country or abroad by those names?

Mr. BROWDER. That I do not know. Of course, some people knew these names.

Mr. WHITLEY. As a matter of fact, you were generally known and referred to on your trips to Russia by the name of Dixon, at least on a number of occasions?

Mr. BROWDER. On some occasions, I believe one time a book of mine was published under that name.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether the party official publications, in referring to you while you were attending conferences abroad, in Moscow, referred to you as Dixon?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe that took place once.

Mr. WHITLEY. On one occasion?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are there any other names other than the two you have mentioned?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your present address, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Home address?

Mr. WHITLEY. Home and business.

Mr. BROWDER. My home address is 7 Highland Place, Yonkers, and my business address, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York City.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where were you born, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. In Wichita, Kans.

Mr. WHITLEY. When were you born?

Mr. BROWDER. On May 20, 1891.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where were you educated?

Mr. BROWDER. I left school when I was 9 years old; what schooling I had was in Wichita. Aside from that I obtained only self-education in correspondence schools.

Mr. WHITLEY. Were you in the World War?

Mr. BROWDER. I suppose you mean as a soldier; I was not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you married or single?

Mr. BROWDER. Married.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you any children?

Mr. BROWDER. I have.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever been arrested in the United States or elsewhere?

Mr. BROWDER. I have been arrested in the United States several times.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you name the occasions and the charge?

Mr. BROWDER. I was arrested in 1917 on the charge of conspiracy to defeat the operation of the draft law. That charge arose out of activities in opposition to the entry of the United States into the World War.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the result of that charge?

Mr. BROWDER. I was sentenced to 2 years in Leavenworth Prison.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any other arrests?

Mr. BROWDER. During the course of my period in jail at that time I was charged with refusing to register for the draft.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was another charge, other than the one on which you were sentenced?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; but two charges were made, one arising out of the first.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the disposition of the second charge?

Mr. BROWDER. That resulted in a sentence of 1 year in jail.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any other arrests?

Mr. BROWDER. I was arrested in Chicago in connection with the Bridgeman convention of the Communist Party in 1922, I believe it was.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the charge on that occasion?

Mr. BROWDER. That was a State charge under the State criminal syndicalism law.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what was the disposition of that charge?

Mr. BROWDER. The charge was dropped after hanging fire in the courts for about 10 years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any other arrests?

Mr. BROWDER. No other involving any charge; no. I have, of course, been held at various times by police officers in connection with some disturbances that used to take place at meetings, although I am glad to say that in at least 8 or 9 years we have had no such occasions.

The CHAIRMAN. Make your answers responsive to the questions.

Mr. WHITLEY. The ones you have mentioned are the only arrests that involved charges in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever been arrested elsewhere?

Mr. BROWDER. I have not.

Mr. WHITLEY. No other arrests?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where have you lived in the United States, Mr. Browder; at what places?

Mr. BROWDER. Wichita, Kans.: Kansas City, Chicago, and New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what occupations have you followed?

Mr. BROWDER. Followed occupations from—beginning with messenger boy, bookkeeper, accountant, building laborer, and so on.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your present occupation, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I am a journalist and secretary of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. The general secretary?

Mr. BROWDER. The general secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long have you been a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Since 1920, although my membership is technically dated from 1919, at the time of the formation of the party. At that time I was in Leavenworth Prison, and my activity began at the end of 1920.

Mr. WHITLEY. What official positions have you held in the Communist Party during the period you have referred to?

Mr. BROWDER. I have been a member of the central committee, or national committee, since the formation of what was then known as the Workers Party in the end of 1921 or beginning of 1922.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you have been a member of the central or national committee since 1921 or 1922?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the governing body of the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other official positions have you held in the Communist Party during that period?

Mr. BROWDER. Since 1930 I have been the general secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. What, if any, official positions have you held in the Communist Party in other countries?

Mr. BROWDER. I have never held any official position in any other Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever been a member of any committees of the Communist International or served in any capacity in the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. Of the Communist International, I have been a member of the executive committee since 1935.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the highest governing body of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you served the Communist International in any capacity elsewhere than in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or as a representative to any other country for the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. I must make one exception to that statement. In 1935 I was an official member of a delegation representing the Communist International to accompany the body of Henri Barbusse, who had died in Moscow, back to Paris and to take part in his funeral as one of the delegation of the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you ever serve the Comintern in any capacity in China?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was your official position or activity when you were in China?

Mr. BROWDER. I was a delegate of the Trade Union Educational League, of the trade-union delegation or workers' delegation that went to China in 1927. While that delegation was in China there took place a trade-union conference in China, with delegates from the United States and elsewhere, and this conference elected me to the secretariat of the committee that was set up for the establishment of trade unions and connections between various countries.

Mr. WHITLEY. That had nothing to do with the Communist Party or the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. No; that was a trade-union activity, a trade-union organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who sent you on that mission, with that delegation?

Mr. BROWDER. The Trade Union Educational League.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Of the United States.

Mr. WHITLEY. As to your present position as the general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, which position you have held since 1930, what is your official capacity there? Are you the head of the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. I am the chief executive.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the official spokesman for the party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your present salary, Mr. Browder, as general secretary of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. \$40 per week.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any other source of income?

Mr. BROWDER. I have, for the past several years, been getting an income from my writings, and from lectures.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you give us approximately the amount of that income?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, the total income, as reported for 1938, was around \$4,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. When was the Communist Party of the United States founded, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. 1919.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where was it founded?

Mr. BROWDER. In Chicago.

Mr. WHITLEY. By whom was it founded?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, it was rather a confused situation, the founding of the Communist Party. The party was born under rather extraordinary conditions which resulted in two parties appearing, a division of the forces of the Communists from the very beginning, and this period of confusion and division lasted for several years. So

it is very difficult give direct, responsive answers to such a question as to who founded the Communist Party, for that lasted a long time.

Mr. WHITLEY. If you will tell me the officers of the Communist Party perhaps that will answer my question.

Mr. BROWDER. Of the two parties formed in September 1919, one called the Communist Party of America had as its secretary Charles E. Ruthenberg, and the one they called the Communist Labor Party—I do not remember who was the secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know who any of the other officers were of either group?

Mr. BROWDER. No: I could not tell from memory; I would have to look up the records.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which of those two groups were you identified with at the time they began?

Mr. BROWDER. I was in the Leavenworth Prison at that time, and therefore was not familiar with the developments, and when I came out of Leavenworth Prison there was already what was called a United Communist Party. That was one of the stages of the development of this process of bringing the two party groups together, and it lasted for about a year.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was the group you first identified yourself with?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you explain for the record the administrative set-up of the Communist Party of the United States, briefly, the administrative structure under which it functions?

Mr. BROWDER. I suppose you want to trace the delegation of authority in the party?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is right: and the manner in which the smaller groups are identified with the larger groups.

Mr. BROWDER. The supreme authority of the Communist Party of the United States is the national convention, made up of delegates from the lower bodies of the party elected on the basis of proportional representation.

This national convention of the Communist Party, under its constitution, elects a national committee, the number being determined by each convention.

The national committee, which meets approximately three times every year, elects in turn what it calls its political committee, which meets weekly, and is the executive body conducting the business of the party.

The national convention elects the chairman and secretary of the party, the general secretary. The national committee elects additional secretaries and designates their special functions for particular work.

Mr. WHITLEY. How often, Mr. Browder, are the national conventions held?

Mr. BROWDER. They are held approximately every 2 years. That has been the uniform practice in the past, but it is now the practice, and it is the rule.

Mr. WHITLEY. They are held when called by the national committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many members, presently, comprise the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. There are 35 members, and 20 candidates, I believe—pardon me, there are 35 members and 25 candidates.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the supreme governing body of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is elected by the national convention?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That body, in turn, elects what is known as the political committee?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the size of that committee?

Mr. BROWDER. The political committee has seven members and six candidates.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the distinction between a member and a candidate?

Mr. BROWDER. The distinction is that if there was a division of opinion in the body it will be decided by the voting members. The candidates are just to take the place of the members if they drop out or are removed, and to participate without a right to vote on questions, or on a division in the work of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the national committee meets approximately three times a year, and in the interim the political committee, consisting of seven members, meets approximately once a week?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. It would be during the period between the conventions that the political committee is the active group, and that is the ruling body in connection with the affairs of the organization; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right, responsible to the national committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, I do not want to take the time to read all these names into the record at the moment, but I will hand you a list of names which I believe represents the members of the national committee, or central committee of the Communist Party at the present time, and I will ask you, if you will, to go over this list, possibly during the lunch period, and see whether it is correct, and then I would like to introduce it into the record and make it a part of the record. Will you do that?

Mr. BROWDER. I will be glad to.

Mr. BROWDER. I will be glad to. (The list referred to follows:)

#### NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U. S. A., ELECTED AT THE TENTH CONVENTION

Wm. Z. Foster, chairman; Earl Browder, general secretary.

*Members.*—Israel Amter, Max Bedacht, Alex Bittelman, A. W. Berry, Ella R. Bloor, Louis Budenz, Peter V. Cacchione, Morris Childs, Gene Dennis, Sam Don, Elizabeth G. Flynn, James W. Ford, Harrison George, Ben Gold, Gil Green, Ray Haushoro, Clarence Hathaway, Jasper Haaland, Angelo Herndon, Roy Hudson, Jack Johnstone, Charles Krumbein, Robert Minor, Steve Nelson, William Schneiderman, Jack Stachel, Pat Toohey, Alex Trachtenberg, William Wiener, Anita Whitney, John Williamson, Henry Winston, Rose Wortis.

*Candidates.*—John Ballam, Herbert Benjamin, W. G. Binkley, Don Burke, Rose Biltmore, Isadore Begin, Ann Burlak, Margaret Cowl, Sam Darcy, Phil Frankfeld, Harry Gwynn, Robert Hall, Albert Lannon, Andrew Onda, William Patterson, Pettis Perry, Morris Raport, Earl Reno, Carl Ross, Nat Ross, Otto Wangenin, Maude White, Wm. W. Weinstone, Robert Woods.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, will you tell us who the members of the political committee are, the seven members of the political committee at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. You will excuse me if I happen to get a little confused between members and candidates, because the distinction in practice is so rarely called upon that I am not certain that I can tell you which one is a member and which a candidate of the 13 members and candidates, but if you are interested in an exact division I can make that for you later.

William Z. Foster and myself, Jack Stachel, James W. Ford, Alexander Bittleman, Charles Krumbein, C. A. Hathaway, Rose Wortis, Henry Winston, Roy Hudson.

Mr. WHITLEY. Israel Amter?

Mr. BROWDER. No; Amter is not. Robert Minor.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is Max Bedacht a member of the political committee?

Mr. BROWDER. No; he is not.

Mr. WHITLEY. A. J. Berry?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Margaret Cowl?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Fred Brown?

Mr. BROWDER. I can check up on those lists later; it will be a simple matter of checking.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who are the present officers of the party, in addition to yourself?

Mr. BROWDER. William Z. Foster, chairman, and myself, general secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those are the only national officers?

Mr. BROWDER. Those are the only officers elected by the national convention.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is treasurer of the party at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. We have what we call a financial secretary, Mr. William Weiner.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is he selected by?

Mr. BROWDER. The national committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other officers are selected by the national committee?

Mr. BROWDER. We have a legislative secretary and an industrial secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you name them for us?

Mr. BROWDER. The legislative secretary is John Dennis, and the industrial secretary is Roy Hudson. The executive secretary is Jack Stachel.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those are the only officers selected by the national committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, in addition to this public or known organization, the Communist Party of the United States, does the Communist Party of the United States maintain what is known as a secret or underground organization?

Mr. BROWDER. No; it does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. It has no machinery or devices for the purpose of operating any secret or underground organization?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. None whatever?

Mr. BROWDER. There has been nothing of that kind since 1923.

Mr. WHITLEY. All of its administrative machinery is open and above ground!

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And consists of the administrative set-up you have just described?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the qualifications for membership in the Communist Party, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. To answer that, I will quote from our statutes.

Mr. WHITLEY. All right, sir.

Mr. BROWDER. I will read from the article of the constitution that deals with the membership of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. All right, sir.

Mr. BROWDER. Article III of the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States, on membership, section 1, says:

Any person 18 years of age or more, regardless of race, sex, color, religious belief, or nationality, who is a citizen or who declared his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States, and whose loyalty to the working class is unquestioned, shall be eligible for membership.

Section 2 provides:

A party member is one who accepts the party program, attends the regular meetings of the membership branch of his place of work or of his territory or trade, who pays dues regularly, and is active in party work.

Section 3 provides:

An applicant for membership shall sign an application card which shall be endorsed by at least two members of the Communist Party. Applications are subject to discussion and decision by the basic organization of the party (shop, industrial, neighborhood branch) to which the application is presented.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe that covers the qualifications for membership. I do not care about the procedure to be followed in acting on the qualifications of a particular member.

Mr. Browder, what percentage of the Communist Party of the United States are citizens?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say 97-98 percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what is the total membership of the Communist Party at the present time, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Approximately 100,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you tell us what the membership was, approximately, in 1929?

Mr. BROWDER. Seven thousand.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you approximate it for 1934?

Mr. BROWDER. From memory I would hesitate; I think about 25,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. By members, you mean dues-paying members?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Regular, active dues-paying members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. Of course, I must qualify that by saying that of the present 100,000 figure that I gave you, I think that the amount of dues payments that reaches the national office is still only about 72 percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. Seventy-two percent of the dues paid?

Mr. BROWDER. That is, 72 percent of that membership is reflected in the dues payments that reach the national office. Our figures show that approximately 100,000 are members, and therefore presumably pay dues, but somewhere in the administrative apparatus of the party some of that gets lost. So when I say dues-paying I do not mean that that would be reflected directly in the dues receipts of the national office to the full extent.

Mr. WHITLEY. How is that membership distributed, Mr. Browder? Can you give us some idea as to whether it is concentrated in certain portions of the United States or fairly well distributed?

Mr. BROWDER. It exists in some 42 States. The largest part of it is in the larger industrial cities. About 25 to 28 thousand are in New York City; about 7,000 in Chicago, as an example.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the approximate membership on the West coast and where is that membership principally located, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe we have about 6,000 members in California, between six and seven thousand. In Washington and Oregon, which are dealt with as one district, there are about 4,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many districts do you have, Mr. Browder, and do they correspond with the States?

Mr. BROWDER. We have 36 districts; in the main they correspond with the States.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the exceptions?

Mr. BROWDER. The exceptions are that some places two or more States are united together for one district because of the lack of sufficient membership to maintain an organization for one State alone. In the State of Pennsylvania we have a district organization for the east and the west.

Mr. WHITLEY. Two districts in the one State?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what States do you not have an organization, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I am afraid I could not identify them offhand, but I can furnish them to you by getting in touch with my office.

(The matter referred to follows:)

#### LIST OF DISTRICTS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U. S. A., AND ADDRESSES

Box 23, Essex Station, Boston, Mass. (Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont).

35 E. 12th Street, New York, N. Y.

250 S. Broad Street, Room 701, Philadelphia, Pa.

729 Central Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas.

305 Seventh Avenue, Room 406, Pittsburgh, Pa.

1524 Prospect Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

5969 Fourteenth Street, Detroit, Michigan.

208 N. Wells Street, Room 201, Chicago, Illinois.

10 South Tenth Street, Room 2, Minneapolis, Minn.

516 Karbach Block, Omaha, Nebraska.

P. O. Box 1467, Fargo, North Dakota.

P. O. Box 332, Seattle, Washington, (Idaho, Washington).

121 Haight Street, San Francisco, California (Arizona, California, Nevada).

1 William Street, Room 405, Newark, N. J.

6 Church Street, Room 212, New Haven, Connecticut.  
P. O. Box 521, Greensboro, North Carolina (North Carolina, South Carolina).  
P. O. Box 1871, Birmingham, Alabama (Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi).  
617 North Second Street, Room 902, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.  
P. O. Box 2823, Denver, Colo. (Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming).  
P. O. 1834, Houston, Texas.  
506 N. Vandeventer Street, Room 21, St. Louis, Missouri (Arkansas, Missouri).  
P. O. Box 92, Charleston, W. Va.  
P. O. Box 1043, Louisville, Kentucky.  
P. O. Box 465, New Orleans, Louisiana.  
P. O. Box N, West Bay Annex, Jacksonville, Florida.  
P. O. Box 366, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.  
P. O. Box 496, Ironwood, Michigan.  
Meridian Life Bldg., Rm. 401, Indianapolis, Ind.  
P. O. Box 132, Richmond, Virginia.  
P. O. Box 77, Butte, Montana.  
Box 245, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.  
222 Youngerman Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa.  
P. O. Box 1692, Knoxville, Tennessee.  
501 B North Eutaw Street, Baltimore, Maryland.  
74 West First Street S., Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Whitley, will you find out from Mr. Browder whether there is a district for the District of Columbia; and also will you find out what the membership is in the District of Columbia?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. Mr. Browder, do you have a district covering the District of Columbia?

Mr. BROWDER. The District of Columbia belongs to the Maryland district.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the approximate membership in the District?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not give you offhand the exact figures. It would be easy for me to get it through my office. I believe it is around 200.

Mr. WHITLEY. Active, dues-paying members?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that in the District of Columbia or in the party district?

Mr. BROWDER. In the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the District of Columbia?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That does not include the Maryland portion?

Mr. BROWDER. Maryland would be much more.

Mr. WHITLEY. You say you will furnish me the names of the States in which you do not have an organization?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many States are there?

Mr. BROWDER. Forty-two States and 36 districts.

Mr. WHITLEY. Forty-two States and 36 districts?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, what administrative records does the Communist Party of the United States maintain?

Mr. BROWDER. We keep our financial records of the national office. We keep a file of all the documents issued by the Communist Party. We keep the correspondence received and sent for a period of a few months, as long as it is current.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is periodically destroyed?

Mr. BROWDER. Periodically destroyed; yes. With the financial records, after the financial records have been audited and the report approved, the financial records are usually destroyed. They are kept for about a year.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is there any purpose behind the destruction of the financial records or the correspondence records?

Mr. BROWDER. No particular purpose except to prevent the accumulation of a lot of material which would have to be taken care of.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Communist Party maintain membership records?

Mr. BROWDER. The national office keeps membership records on the basis of the reports of the lower organizations.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you keep a list of the names and addresses of the members?

Mr. BROWDER. Of the individual members—no; we do not.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you ever maintain such a list?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You never have?

Mr. BROWDER. We never have.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have never had occasion to have such a list destroyed, then?

Mr. BROWDER. The only place where such lists are made or kept is in the branch.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the branch?

Mr. BROWDER. The branch has a list of its own members.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the smaller unit within the district?

Mr. BROWDER. That is the basic unit of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know approximately how many branches there are in the United States, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Between four and five thousand.

Mr. WHITLEY. Four and five thousand?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And they are the smaller unit administrative group in the district?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you develop that matter of the branch? Does that mean that they have offices of their own and are they officially a part of the organization? What part do they play in it?

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the administrative set-up of the branch, or where does it fit into the administrative organization of the party, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Perhaps I should answer that by quoting the constitution of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. The branches were formerly called units, were they not?

Mr. BROWDER. In the course of years they have been known by many names. But the branch is the official name and is the one uniform practice that has not fluctuated.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is the smallest administrative group of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is the place where an individual holds membership in the party, and only there.

Mr. WHITLEY. He holds membership there?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. The branches have been called units, have they not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Or cells?

Mr. WHITLEY. Have they also been called cells?

Mr. BROWDER. I have never used that term myself.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has it been used to describe the smaller groups?

Mr. BROWDER. Not generally.

Mr. WHITLEY. But it has been used?

Mr. BROWDER. As a translation from other languages in describing other Communist parties in other countries.

Mr. WHITLEY. But the smaller administrative groups in the United States have been referred to, if not by yourself, by others, as cells?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And they have been referred to as units?

Mr. BROWDER. And nuclei, and so forth; various terms.

Mr. WHITLEY. But the official term that you designate those smaller groups by is branch?

Mr. BROWDER. Branch: that is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give us the administrative set-up of the branch? That is, where does it fit into the administrative structure of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. In article VII of the constitution on the structure of the party, section 1 says:

The basic organization of the Communist Party of the United States are the shop, industrial, and territorial branches. The executive committee of the branch shall be elected once a year by the membership.

That is the basic provision for this first structure of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the branches make up the district organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Between the branches and the district organization there is some section organization in most States.

Mr. WHITLEY. That depends on the size—

Mr. BROWDER. That depends on the size of the party, where an intermediate link is required by the number of members, section organizations are set up.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the average size of the branch, Mr. Browder? Is it quite small?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say the average would be about 20 to 25.

Mr. WHITLEY. Twenty to twenty-five members?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does its branch have a leader or a head?

Mr. BROWDER. They have an executive committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. An executive committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And does that committee maintain its own offices and its own administrative records?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And are those officers publicly known? Is there any attempt to conceal the committee which governs the branch?

Mr. BROWDER. It depends entirely on the conditions under which they work. Some branches composed of members in shops, where their jobs would be endangered if their politics were known, will not make public their membership.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the branch makes its reports and its financial returns either to the section organization or to the district organization?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the district, in turn, makes its report and its financial return to the national organization?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Right there. Mr. Counsel, you say section or district. Do you mean that they are the same thing?

Mr. WHITLEY. No. Some of the larger districts are broken up by an organization called a section. That is, where the membership justifies it. That is my understanding. Is that correct, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is only in a few cases?

Mr. BROWDER. No; in most cases.

Mr. WHITLEY. The district is divided by sections, and the section, in turn, is divided up into branches. And the branches and the sections and the districts all have their executive committees?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. Each body has its executive committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. And each maintains its own administrative records?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. For their particular group.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you say the only membership lists are maintained in the branches?

Mr. BROWDER. In the branches.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are those maintained as a matter of record? Is it a part of the records of the branch or is it just known to the executive committee of the branch?

Mr. BROWDER. It is a part of the records of the branch as the usual practice.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you say there are approximately 4,000 branches?

Mr. BROWDER. Approximately.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the national organization has never maintained any membership lists?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is there any particular reason for that, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. It would be an impossible administrative task.

Mr. WHITLEY. What type of reports does the district make to the national headquarters?

Mr. BROWDER. The districts, first of all, report on the number of dues-paying members each month and purchase from the national office dues stamps corresponding to this number. The districts periodically give political reports.

Mr. WHITLEY. Periodically? How often?

Mr. BROWDER. On their own initiative or when called upon by the national office; political reports on the political developments of their district, State, or region.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are those reports written or oral?

Mr. BROWDER. Sometimes written, sometimes oral, depending upon the circumstances.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the financial report, in turn, is made by the district once a month?

Mr. BROWDER. Once a month.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does it give the number of members in that district that pay dues that month?

Mr. BROWDER. The regular financial reports deal not with members as registered members, but with the members paying dues.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the political reports come in not periodically but when called for or when volunteered?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And they deal with conditions in the district?

Mr. BROWDER. The political developments of the district.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the district organization which makes that report to you gets its reports from the smaller groups in its district, namely, the section and the branch?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are those reports kept on file, where they are made in writing?

Mr. BROWDER. They are kept while they are current.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are all of the records of the Communist Party maintained at the national headquarters in New York?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. There are no secret records kept elsewhere?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand, Mr. Counsel, that if we went to a section or to a branch, we could secure a list of the membership, the true names of the members? Will you develop that fact?

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that correct, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I suppose you could.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would there be any attempt to conceal the records of the membership in the branches?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I can only speak for the national organization. As far as the national organization is concerned, there would not be.

Mr. WHITLEY. The branch would follow the instructions of the national organization in such an instance?

Mr. BROWDER. If they followed our instructions, they would take the same course.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that course would be to make its membership lists available?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that there would always be certain reservations about people whose jobs would be endangered by their names being placed on public records.

Mr. WHITLEY. Why should their jobs be endangered, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Because it has even been suggested in the hearings of this committee, as I read the record, that there should be organized a campaign to remove Communists from their jobs. We have to try

to prevent that from happening to the members. We do not want people to lose their means of livelihood by joining our party.

Mr. WHITLEY. So you, as the national secretary, would not issue instructions to your branches to make the membership lists available?

Mr. BROWDER. I would leave it up to them to determine whether they are endangering the jobs of their members thereby.

Mr. STARNES. May I ask a question there? What jobs are endangered, Mr. Browder? I mean by that, what are the jobs that you think would be endangered by the disclosure of the names to this committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, perhaps I should call attention—

Mr. STARNES. I would like to have an answer to that question. What is the nature of the jobs?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is talking about the nature of the jobs.

Mr. BROWDER. Jobs in industries.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean private jobs?

Mr. BROWDER. Private jobs; yes. Jobs in factories; jobs in shops where people make their living.

Mr. STARNES. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. BROWDER. Most of our members are people who work in the shops.

The CHAIRMAN. You have answered the question.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, what are the sources of income of your organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Dues and initiation fees; contributions from individuals, and organizational income; that is, income from meetings, and so on, from the organizational activities which cannot be specifically identified as dues and individual contributions.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is, where you have a meeting or a rally of some type?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And charge admission?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right. That is one of the principal sources.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the membership dues and what are the initiation fees, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. The initiation fee is 10 cents for an unemployed and 50 cents for employed persons.

Mr. WHITLEY. What percentage of that goes to the national headquarters and what percentage is kept by the branch or section or district?

Mr. BROWDER. The branch keeps 25 percent of this income; 35 percent goes to the national office. The remaining 40 percent is distributed among the State, county, city, or section organizations that may exist between the national office and the branch.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the membership dues in the party?

Mr. BROWDER. The scale of dues now in force is as follows: Housewives, unemployed or members earning up to \$47 per month pay 10 cents a month. All members earning from \$47 to \$80 a month pay 25 cents. All members earning from \$80 to \$112 a month pay 50 cents. Members earning from \$112 to \$160 per month pay \$1 per month. Members earning more than \$160 per month pay, besides the regular \$1 per month dues, additional dues at the rate of 50 cents for each additional \$10 or fraction thereof.

Mr. WHITLEY. What percentage of the monthly dues goes to the national organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Thirty-five percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the balance is distributed for the administrative operations of the branch and the section and the district?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; and city committees, and so forth.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Whitley, will you find out what are the average dues among the 100,000 members?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. Can you give us the average dues paid by the 100,000 members, Mr. Browder—the monthly dues?

Mr. BROWDER. I could give you an approximation. I do not have any very accurate figures already prepared on such a thing. For the year 1938 the income of the national office for dues was \$65,000. That means the dues paid by the members would be about three times that much. That is about \$200,000 during the year was paid by the membership for dues. The average number of members during the year paying that would be about 70—75,000.

Mr. STARNES. I would like to ascertain what disposition is made of the 35 percent that goes to the national office; whether any of it goes in turn to the international organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. I am going to develop that.

Mr. CASEY. What is the high and what is the low of the dues paid?

Mr. BROWDER. The low is 10 cents per month. The high—the limit is determined only by the amount of the income. It is 50 cents per month for each \$10 per month income.

Mr. CASEY. And what is the highest individual dues paid in the last year?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not say.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, you gave us your approximation of the total membership. Maintaining no membership records, how do you arrive at that figure?

Mr. BROWDER. The amount of dues payments is checked by a periodical registration of the membership. That is, the branches are called upon to register their members twice a year; to have them appear and to make a registration. The totals of these registrations are transmitted to the organization, to the national office.

Mr. WHITLEY. The totals, but not the names?

Mr. BROWDER. Not the names, no.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you do get a report twice a year of the total membership?

Mr. BROWDER. Independently of the dues records; yes. That is a means of checking our dues records and it is this that discloses to us that we have more members than appears in purely the financial records.

Mr. WHITLEY. And 35 percent of all initiation fees and all membership dues go to maintain the national organization and the balance is used to maintain the district, section, and branch organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. Thirty-five percent of the dues and 50 percent of the initiation fee.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, you mentioned as one of the sources of income contributions. Can you give us the approximate number and amount—the total amount of contributions received?

Mr. BROWDER. I would estimate, in the course of a year, we will receive around 800 to 1,200 individual contributions of amounts that are taken note of. That is, it is not just a contribution through a collection at a meeting, but made to officers of the organization in the various States.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the approximate total of those 800 to 1,200 contributions?

Mr. BROWDER. Approximately the same total as the dues: maybe a little more or a little less.

Mr. WHITLEY. \$65,000?

Mr. BROWDER. Around that.

The CHAIRMAN. From whom do they come, sympathizers or members?

Mr. WHITLEY. Are those contributions from party members?

Mr. BROWDER. Sympathizers.

Mr. WHITLEY. Sympathizers?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Individuals or organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. Individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. How do they range? How much would a large contribution be?

Mr. WHITLEY. How do these contributions range?

Mr. BROWDER. It varies from year to year. In 1936, for example, during the Presidential campaign, we would have to say we received thousands of contributions ranging from \$500—I think we had a few of a thousand dollars—

The CHAIRMAN. Why do you take a Presidential year? What would that have to do with bringing in the contributions?

Mr. BROWDER. We made a special appeal for funds to finance the election campaign, establishing a special election campaign fund.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean for your candidate?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. For the Communist candidates throughout the country.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right. We had a special committee in charge of the campaign, under the laws of the country, to be responsible for making all reports that were necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. So that these contributions were really contributions to the campaign?

Mr. BROWDER. To the campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. To finance the national campaign of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Who were the candidates in 1936?

Mr. BROWDER. I was the candidate for President. James W. Ford was the candidate for Vice President.

Mr. THOMAS. How many votes did you receive in 1936?

Mr. BROWDER. According to the reports, I received 84,000 votes.

Mr. THOMAS. Why do you say according to the reports? Did you receive 84,000 votes?

Mr. BROWDER. We have some indications that I received somewhat more than that, but not always were they registered.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you got thousands of contributions that year?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And only got 84,000 votes?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Your contributions were nearly as great in number as your votes, were they not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. I think we raised more than \$84,000 for the campaign. And if the object of our campaign had been votes, it could be considered a failure, because we did not get many votes.

Mr. CASEY. Was your membership during the Presidential campaign year 100,000?

Mr. BROWDER. No. Our membership was approximately 50,000.

Mr. CASEY. So that you got 34,000 votes—

Mr. BROWDER. Between forty and fifty thousand.

Mr. CASEY. In addition to your membership total, you got 34,000 votes?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; about twice as many as the membership.

Mr. STARNES. How many votes were cast for Communist candidates in the general election of 1938?

Mr. BROWDER. 1938?

Mr. STARNES. Throughout the country?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say around 300,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Would that mean—that large difference between 1936 and 1938—would that mean a very large growth in sympathy for your party, or would it mean that in 1936, a great many of those who were sympathetic to the Communist cause supported some other candidate other than yourself?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say most of those who were sympathetic to the party in 1936 voted for the President.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Browder, you made a speech down in Charlottesville at that institute, in which you said, I believe, something to the effect that a very substantial offer had been made in 1936 to you if you would withdraw your candidacy officially and officially endorse the Democratic candidate.

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS. I wonder if you would like to elaborate on that. Have you any proof of that fact?

Mr. BROWDER. I have no documentary proof. But there are other people who knew about this at the time, and if any authoritative body were interested in going deeply into it, I am sure they could get more facts even than I have.

Mr. VOORHIS. What was the purpose of such an offer?

Mr. BROWDER. I think the purpose of the offer was clear; that the gentleman who conceived the idea thought that since the Communist Party has only a very small following in the country, comparatively speaking, if the relative unpopularity of the Communist Party could be attached to the popular candidate for President, this would diminish his vote.

Mr. STARNES. Would you give us the names of the people who made that offer?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know them personally and the representative that they sent to me—I do not know who he was. He introduced himself by the name of Davidson.

Mr. STARNES. Did he tell you who he represented, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. He said that he represented a group of people who had money that they wanted to use for a public purpose, and he said that he thought that while they were opposed to the politics of the Communists that he thought they ought to be able to do business because they were willing to help the Communist Party—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). Mr. Browder, did he name them?

Mr. STARNES. Did he name any of those persons?

Mr. BROWDER. He did not name those people.

Mr. THOMAS. I think he should be more specific and tell us the names of them.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood his testimony to be that he doesn't know them.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. All you know is that someone who said his name was Davidson said he represented certain groups.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Who had money provided they could do business with your organization.

Mr. STARNES. Where did that meeting take place?

Mr. THOMAS. Where did this meeting take place?

Mr. BROWDER. The gentleman came directly to my office.

Mr. STARNES. Where was that?

Mr. BROWDER. The gentleman came directly to my New York office.

Mr. STARNES. In New York City?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Will you name the date?

Mr. BROWDER. I can't be exact, but approximately it was—let me see—toward the end of May 1936.

Mr. STARNES. May 1936?

Mr. BROWDER. May 1936.

Mr. STARNES. Were you actively conducting a campaign at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. I was not yet named; and the conventions took place shortly thereafter.

Mr. STARNES. And neither of the parties at that time—major political parties—up to that time had named their candidates?

Mr. BROWDER. It was right during the convention period.

Mr. STARNES. Both of the conventions were held in the latter part of June; isn't that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You think this was in May of 1936?

Mr. BROWDER. In May, I believe.

Mr. STARNES. Did he give you his full name?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Had you ever seen him before?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Have you ever seen him since?

Mr. BROWDER. I have not.

Mr. STARNES. Did he name any specific amount of money?

Mr. BROWDER. He did.

Mr. STARNES. How much?

Mr. BROWDER. At first he named \$100,000. and then when I reacted rather coldly to the whole proposition he tried to warm me up to it by raising the ante to \$250,000.

Mr. STARNES. And then what happened?

Mr. BROWDER. I told the gentleman that it would be very unlikely that any circumstance could arise where we could cooperate.

Mr. STARNES. Did he offer that money to you personally, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. He did not have any money in his hands. He made a general proposition.

Mr. STARNES. I mean did he offer to pay that to you personally, if you would do what he wanted?

Mr. BROWDER. His proposal was that it would go to the Communist party.

Mr. STARNES. For any purpose it saw fit to use it?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; for the purpose of communistic propaganda.

Mr. STARNES. I see. And you refused to accept the money, the funds for that purpose?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not. I merely received the proposition rather coldly and discouraged the gentleman in the hope that he would continue to talk and give me more information, and I had subsequent conferences with him.

Mr. STARNES. Where did they take place?

Mr. BROWDER. In fact, I went so far as to ask him to interview some other people as to how he could demonstrate he really meant business by depositing the money in a bank where it would be paid over under certain conditions. I wanted to see how far he would go. Before we got any evidence which could be documentary he suddenly disappeared. My impression is that it was because he received some sort of a tip that I wasn't doing business with him because I had in the meantime sent word through individuals asking them to transmit the information of this proposal to the Democratic Party.

Mr. STARNES. To whom in the Democratic Party?

Mr. BROWDER. The individual that I asked to transmit the information was to communicate with the secretary of the Democratic Party.

Mr. STARNES. How many meetings did you have with this individual after you had the first meeting?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say three or four.

Mr. STARNES. Where did they take place?

Mr. BROWDER. In the Grand Central Station.

Mr. STARNES. New York city?

Mr. BROWDER. In New York city.

Mr. STARNES. Just in the lobby there?

Mr. BROWDER. In the dining room.

Mr. STARNES. In the dining room by prearrangement?

Mr. BROWDER. By prearrangement.

Mr. STARNES. When did the last meeting take place?

Mr. BROWDER. Early in July.

Mr. STARNES. Early in July?

Mr. BROWDER. Or the end of June.

Mr. STARNES. So you carried negotiations on from the month of May until probably around the early part of July, and you had a number of meetings; did you say how many meetings?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say four, possibly five.

Mr. STARNES. Did he ever give you his address or telephone number?

Mr. BROWDER. He did not.

Mr. STARNES. How did you get in touch with him?

Mr. BROWDER. He called me up.

Mr. STARNES. Each time?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Did you make any attempt to trace the calls?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not, because I did not have the facilities for doing so.

Mr. STARNES. Was there any correspondence or any memoranda?

Mr. BROWDER. No memoranda.

Mr. STARNES. Each time thereafter the meetings were in the dining room of the Grand Central Station?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. After the first offer was made.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Was there any particular reason why you met in the Grand Central?

Mr. BROWDER. He said he didn't want to come to my office and ask me to meet him outside.

Mr. STARNES. Was there any other figure after the \$250,000 mentioned?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Were any names ever mentioned at any time as to persons who would furnish the money?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; he gave me certain details without names. He said that there were about six or seven people in his group that he knew could furnish the fund, and at one time he spoke about one of the members of the group having just arrived from abroad.

Mr. STARNES. Did he indicate the character of business in which these men were engaged, or why he wouldn't give their names?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Did he give you information as to their affiliation?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; he said they were all Republicans.

Mr. STARNES. Did he say anything else about them?

Mr. BROWDER. That they were very much interested in the Presidential election.

Mr. STARNES. So much so that they were personally willing to contribute \$250,000 to your political party to induce you to identify yourself with another political party?

Mr. BROWDER. That was the exact proposition that he made.

Mr. STARNES. Did he give his first name or initials?

Mr. BROWDER. He did not give it.

Mr. STARNES. Never.

Mr. BROWDER. He said his name was Davidson.

Mr. STARNES. Would you recognize that man if you saw him?

Mr. BROWDER. I would.

Mr. STARNES. Will you give us a general description of this man Davidson?

Mr. BROWDER. A man of medium height, dark hair, dark complexion; I believe brown eyes, but I would not be certain of that. Close shaven, with a heavy beard showing through the skin. Neatly dressed always in a gray business tweed. Looks like a typical executive or industrialist or banker or broker.

Mr. STARNES. Did you ever receive any contributions from bankers or brokers or industrialists for the purpose of your party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is very unusual.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to see if I can understand this. The proposal was that they would make a contribution to your party of \$250,000 if you would agree to withdraw in favor of President Roosevelt?

Mr. BROWDER. That was the proposition; the original proposition was if we would nominate Roosevelt on the Communist ticket.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. When I just laughed at that he then made a modified proposition to withdraw in favor of him.

The CHAIRMAN. The thought was if you would do that it would hurt the President.

Mr. BROWDER. It was.

The CHAIRMAN. And they were willing to pay you \$250,000, that is, your organization to do that?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. On the theory that your support would hurt Roosevelt?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You did come out and endorse the President in 1936, did you not?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. At that time you made statements in his behalf, did you not?

Mr. BROWDER. I spoke in favor of the policies, but I carefully refrained from endorsing the President because that is precisely what they wanted me to do.

The CHAIRMAN. You confined your endorsement to policies?

Mr. BROWDER. The policies of the New Deal.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to ask you a question. What was the date on which you first made an announcement that this offer had been made to you?

Mr. BROWDER. Just a few weeks ago.

Mr. THOMAS. You just made that a few weeks ago?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. You kept it a secret all this time?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. Why did you not make an announcement of that kind during the campaign in 1936?

Mr. BROWDER. It was the intention if I could get sufficient evidence, and I had even entered into communication with some Democrats to prepare for that. But in the absence of documentary evidence I thought at the time it would only serve to confuse the campaign and therefore should not be disclosed at the time the campaign was on.

Mr. THOMAS. You just mentioned you had been in communication with certain Democrats. What Democrats?

Mr. BROWDER. If you want to have the full story about that—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). You said that you had contacted certain Democrats.

Mr. BROWDER. The first man that I got in contact with was Heywood Broun.

Mr. THOMAS. He is one of the Democrats you referred to?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. I got in touch with the editor of one of the New York papers and asked him if he had any connections whatever with the Democratic Party if he would transmit this information to a representative of the Democratic Party.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you know whether he did that or not?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know, because he is a man who does not take organizational work of that kind very seriously and I don't know how far he carried it.

When I didn't hear anything from that message I then got in touch with the editor of the New York Post and asked him to transmit the information. From that I got an answer and I was called into conference with another gentleman who didn't give me his name.

Mr. THOMAS. And you did not ask him his name?

Mr. BROWDER. But he said he would give this information to Senator Guffey.

Mr. THOMAS. You have been conferring with Democrats lately in regard to this matter?

Mr. BROWDER. At the time this was at the time of 1936; I am speaking now of about the time that the conventions were on.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you visited Washington this year, other than this occasion; have you been back?

Mr. BROWDER. This year—I believe I have not been in Washington; no. I am not certain about it.

Mr. THOMAS. You haven't been in Washington, D. C., at any other time this year?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe not; I am not positive; I don't remember all of my speaking engagements.

Mr. THOMAS. If you visited Washington, D. C., you would recall it, wouldn't you?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't remember clearly—I was here in October—whether I have been here since last year, sometime this year, but I believe it was last year, the last time that I was here.

Mr. THOMAS. You definitely state you haven't been in Washington, D. C., on any other particular visit?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I would want to check.

Mr. THOMAS. You must know whether you were.

Mr. BROWDER. To the best of my recollection it was last October.

Mr. THOMAS. You are certain you have not been in Washington this year?

Mr. BROWDER. To the best of my recollection.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall the name of any other person who ever sat in on conferences with you and Mr. Davidson?

Mr. BROWDER. There was one other person who could possibly give you more detailed information as to the identity of some of these people.

Mr. STARNES. We would like to have the name.

Mr. BROWDER. Because there was—I called in a banker from Canada.

Mr. STARNES. From Canada?

Mr. BROWDER. A banker from Canada.

Mr. THOMAS. From the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. BROWDER. From the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. STARNES. What was that banker's name?

Mr. BROWDER. I would prefer to give you the name privately.

Mr. STARNES. Do you mind disclosing here the reason why this man's name was given, mentioned, to Mr. Davidson?

Mr. BROWDER. The reason was—I sent his name myself as a person who could negotiate with the gentleman as to how such a sum of money could be handled.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you know whether he was someone connected with the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I do not think he was. I secured the name through some trade-union connections.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you know whether he was sympathetic to the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you give the name to the committee, off the record?

Mr. BROWDER. Privately.

Mr. THOMAS. Later on?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Was there any other party who sat in on a conference, or with whom you were in touch? That is what I was trying to get at.

Mr. BROWDER. Individuals, none, except Heywood Broun and Mr. Stone of the Post.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Stone of what place?

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Stone of the editorial staff of the Post.

Mr. STARNES. The New York Post?

Mr. BROWDER. New York Post.

Mr. STARNES. Anyone else?

Mr. BROWDER. The banker. The others' names I do not know.

Mr. THOMAS. Is it not true that all the information they had came through you?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. They wouldn't know except what you told them.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right; the only one who could give you any other information is the Canadian banker.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, gentlemen, anything further?

Mr. WHITLEY. Getting back to the source of income—

Mr. STARNES. Just before you begin that line of questions I want to make this inquiry. I have heard a great many thing said about the man, but this is the first time I have heard it intimated Heywood Broun was a Democrat.

Mr. BROWDER. That is what he always says. I do not know. I have never seen his party card.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, getting back to the source of income of the Communist Party of the United States. You have indicated one source. You have stated that approximately the annual income of it, recently, from dues, was about \$65,000. In 1935 that the national organization received between 800 and 1,200 contributions, making up a total of approximately \$65,000.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; \$65,000 to \$70,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the average, recently?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other sources of income, Mr. Browder, does the party have?

Mr. BROWDER. Organizational income, meetings, and so forth, that is about the same total.

Mr. WHITLEY. About the same?

Mr. BROWDER. The total national income would be covered in the three groups.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got all sources of income except contributions; have you covered that?

Mr. WHITLEY. No; I have not yet.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to find out definitely something about the contributions.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. The income for the national party from the organizational activities you say is about the same?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the matter of contributions, getting back to that, I believe you stated a moment ago that between 800 and 1,200 annual contributions were received from persons outside the party.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And individuals, and not organizations and groups.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And these individuals, Mr. Browder, are persons who are just sympathetic to the party; or are they in some way actively sympathetic?

Mr. BROWDER. They are interested in the work the party is doing; they are interested in its work.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask what type of people make the contributions. Are they all workers?

Mr. BROWDER. Not all workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Generally what type of people?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say it is principally the middle class.

The CHAIRMAN. The middle class of people?

Mr. BROWDER. Workers do not usually have money enough or in sufficient amounts to be listed as individual contributors.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. STARNES. By class, you mean middle class, idealists?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I do not know whether they are idealists. That is a philosophical question that I cannot answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Browder, what I was trying to find out was when you say middle class whether you mean the class of industrialists, stockholders, or of the intelligentsia.

Mr. BROWDER. All sorts.

The CHAIRMAN. All sorts; they come, for instance, from teachers. Do they come from the professions?

Mr. BROWDER. Undoubtedly; some are teachers.

The CHAIRMAN. Lawyers?

Mr. BROWDER. Lawyers.

The CHAIRMAN. Doctors?

Mr. BROWDER. Doctors; dentists.

The CHAIRMAN. Dentists!

Mr. BROWDER. Dentists; businessmen.

The CHAIRMAN. Businessmen.

Mr. BROWDER. Merchants.

The CHAIRMAN. Merchants?

Mr. BROWDER. And some manufacturers.

The CHAIRMAN. So that in 1936 you got thousands of such contributions?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you list the contributions?

Mr. BROWDER. In the election campaign such contributions are listed, showing the receipts as required by law.

Mr. THOMAS. You did list them?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Those were people who were interested in your success in the 1936 campaign?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes: they were interested in strengthening the message we were bringing to the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they so much interested in the success of the party as in the views it endorsed?

Mr. BROWDER. Stressing of viewpoints.

The CHAIRMAN. Stressing your views.

Mr. THOMAS. Principally Communists?

Mr. BROWDER. Communists, and most anybody who was interested in what the Communists were doing.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, Mr. Browder, the three sources you have already listed show approximate income, from those sources, in the amount of \$195,000. What other sources of income did the national organization have?

Mr. BROWDER. To be exact the income in 1938 was a little over \$200,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. A little over \$200,000?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other sources of income has the national organization, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. That is all. Certain sums identified with local organization income.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. One could make a more detailed break-down of that but it would have no significance.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether the Communist Party of the United States receives or has ever received a subsidy from the Soviet Government?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party in the time that I have been its general secretary, the only time I can speak from personal knowledge, has never received any subsidy from any source outside the United States.

Mr. WHITLEY. That would include the Soviet Government, the Comintern, or Communists of other countries?

Mr. BROWDER. Correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. It has never received any contribution or subsidy of that kind?

Mr. BROWDER. It has never received any financial support from outside the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. That is an unqualified statement?

Mr. BROWDER. Unqualified: yes.

Mr. STARNES. Let me ask this question with reference to the secretaryship of the party. You said while you were general secretary.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. I can only speak for the time when I was secretary of the party.

Mr. STARNES. And you became general secretary in 1930?

Mr. BROWDER. 1930.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the three sources you have named constitute the only sources of income?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. For the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, Mr. Browder, what is the total annual budget, approximately, of the national party for all its activities?

Mr. BROWDER. You must get a picture of the organizational set-up before you would understand my answer.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you explain, please?

Mr. BROWDER. The budget of the national office of the Communist Party is confined entirely to the activities directly carried on from headquarters.

Mr. WHITLEY. From the national headquarters?

Mr. BROWDER. From the national headquarters; yes. The budget for that, for 1938, was \$200,000, approximately.

Mr. WHITLEY. \$200,000?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. In addition to that, of course, there are many activities of the party which are organized in different forms and which are not financed through the national headquarters.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. There is, for example, the Daily Worker.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. That has its own financial system; it is a corporation. It has its own financial system, financed through regular directors meetings; and at times the paper makes appeals, public appeals for donations directly to it and it raises considerable money in that way.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. And all that is entirely outside the budget.

Mr. WHITLEY. The budget of the Communist Party, at national headquarters?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In addition to that, similar activities, or rather income and budget expenses, outside the national organization are carried on in each district, which have their own financial set-up?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Through their own income, through dues?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And organizational activities, possibly contributions.

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. The same source as the national party.

Mr. BROWDER. The same as national headquarters.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the average budget of the districts, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. It varies from district to district.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would be the largest budget for that purpose?

Mr. BROWDER. New York City district organization; its budget, I believe, is larger than that of the national.

Mr. WHITLEY. How much larger?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not name the exact figure.

Mr. WHITLEY. Approximately?

Mr. BROWDER. I think somewhat larger.

Mr. WHITLEY. Somewhat larger?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say \$15,000, \$20,000, or \$35,000?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not like to give any exact statement as regards its financial activities—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). Well, you have some idea as to what the budget of the New York district organization would be, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, on details, such as finances, I never like to give such estimates. As to certain basic facts, I believe I can make a statement.

Mr. WHITLEY. Well, we are willing for you to use your best approximation.

Mr. BROWDER. I do not like to make an estimate as to something that can be gotten accurately without much delay.

Mr. THOMAS. You can get that information, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I can.

Mr. WHITLEY. You can give us that figure?

Mr. BROWDER. I can give it to you.

Mr. WHITLEY. You will give it to us?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you get it in a little while?

Mr. BROWDER. I can have it by tomorrow, I believe.

Mr. STARNES. So that it will be accurate?

Mr. BROWDER. If I get the information I am quite sure it will be.

Mr. WHITLEY. Very well. The New York district organization is the largest and has the largest budget of any district?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you believe it is a little larger than the budget of the national organization?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you will give us the exact figures?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. A little later on?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are all of the financial transactions of the Communist Party of the United States handled through banking institutions. Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you explain the manner in which they are handled?

Mr. BROWDER. We formerly had a system of handling the finances through bank accounts but at the time of the bank crash, beginning in 1933, we began a system, under necessity, of handling larger amounts of cash without going through the banks.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. And since that time—up to that time we did everything through banking accounts, but since that time the current business is often done in cash.

Mr. WHITLEY. The cash business you mentioned referred to national headquarters?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Such as miscellaneous expenses?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Communist Party have an outside vault, maintain a vault at any place?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Except the bank account at headquarters?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many bank accounts does the Communist Party have, the national organization, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. We do not have any bank account in the name of the Communist Party, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. WHITLEY. Under whose name is the account?

Mr. BROWDER. Financial secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Mr. Weiner?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. The bank account is in his name?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what bank?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe it is the Amalgamated Bank.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does it have any others?

Mr. BROWDER. I cannot say for certain.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know whether it does have or not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have a report of the financial transactions of the party, showing the expenses, of its cash, and so forth?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Right at that point: Has the bank account you referred to been in his name right along?

Mr. BROWDER. I think so.

Mr. THOMAS. How long.

Mr. BROWDER. While he has been the financial secretary.

Mr. THOMAS. How long has he been financial secretary?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know exactly.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you belong to any other organizations other than the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Political organizations, you mean?

Mr. WHITLEY. Organizations of any kind.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I belong to many.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you name some of them in which you have been actively identified?

Mr. BROWDER. The International Labor Defense; American League for Peace and Democracy; International Workers Order, an insurance organization that I insured in. I was a member of the office workers union but I think I am in bad standing; they do not take executives.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any other groups or organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't recall any offhand.

Mr. WHITLEY. Had you held any official positions in those organizations you have just named?

Mr. BROWDER. I was one of the founders of the International Labor Defense, or of an organization out of which the International Labor Defense grew. I think the first one was called the Labor Defense Council. That was an organization set up for the purpose of hiring an attorney, Frank Walsh, to defend the Michigan cases and to raise money for that purpose.

That was merged later into the organization now called the International Labor Defense.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you an office in that organization?

Mr. BROWDER. I have not been an officer in the International Labor Defense for sometime.

Mr. WHITLEY. What official position did you hold in it?

Mr. BROWDER. I was a member of the committee in the Labor Defense Council.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. And I believe that at one time I was on the board of International Labor Defense, but I wasn't active and they dropped me off.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you held any other official position in the International Labor Defense?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. No official position?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about the American League for Peace?

Mr. BROWDER. I was a vice president of the American League for Peace and Democracy until November 1937.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. And those are all the organizations that you have been identified with, that is, of any significance?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; that is all.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, to repeat for just a moment, Mr. Browder. At the present time, in addition to being general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, you are a member of the executive committee of the Comintern; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right—of the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, who are the men upon whose books or writings communism is based, or founded?

Mr. BROWDER. The greatest authorities on the theory of communism are Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

Mr. STARNES. Who was the second? I did not get the second name.

Mr. WHITLEY. Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.

Mr. BROWDER. Karl Marx; Frederick Engels, collaborator with Marx; Vladimir Ilich Lenin; and Joseph Stalin.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, what books or writings of the persons or authors you have just named would you select as best representing the principles and purposes of communism?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I would say that in the writings of Lenin and Stalin you have summed up the teachings of Marx and Engels, and their further development under the conditions of the twentieth century. If one was to pick out particular writings which would best represent it, I would say the two volumes of the collected works of Stalin, published under the name of Leninism.

Mr. WHITLEY. Foundations of Leninism?

Mr. BROWDER. Foundations of Leninism is only one part of that.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. The two volumes are known as Leninism?

Mr. BROWDER. As Leninism; yes. That is a collection of the writings and of speeches of Stalin for the period of 1924 to 1929, aside from those things which were purely topical and of the day. Eliminating those, in those writings you have the best expression of the theory of communism.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, getting back to the books, or the teachings upon which communism is founded, would you list the Manifesto by Marx and Lenin as one of the basic works on communism?

Mr. BROWDER. I suppose you refer to the Communist Manifesto of 1848 by Marx and Engels.

Mr. WHITLEY. By Marx and Engels; that is correct.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I would say that is one of the greatest historical documents as marking the foundation of the theory of scientific socialism.

Mr. WHITLEY. And would you classify Das Kapital, by Marx, as one of the basic works on communism?

Mr. BROWDER. One of the basic works.

Mr. WHITLEY. And one of the works—

Mr. BROWDER. Indispensable to any understanding of the economic question.

Mr. WHITLEY. And presents the principles and purposes of communism?

Mr. BROWDER. Presents an understanding of communism and the problems of economics. It is not a program.

Mr. WHITLEY. State and Revolution, by Lenin; would you classify that as one of the basic works?

Mr. BROWDER. I would classify that as one of the basic works.

Mr. WHITLEY. And one of the works which presents the principles and purposes of communism?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes—one of the great books.

Mr. WHITLEY. Left Wing Communism, by Stalin?

Mr. BROWDER. By Lenin.

Mr. WHITLEY. By Lenin?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you so classify that?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Two Tactics?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Also by Lenin?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And What is to be Done, by Lenin, is another one of the basic works on communism?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I would like to introduce those works in the record at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean as exhibits?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just to have them identified by the reporter.

Mr. BROWDER. I believe on Capital you only have volume 1. There are three volumes to it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; that is the first volume.

Mr. THOMAS. Are all those in English, or in some foreign language?

Mr. WHITLEY. They are all in English.

(The books above referred to were marked "September 5, 1939.  
Witness Browder, W. R. G.")

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, is the most authoritative definition or statement on the present line of the Communist Party set forth in The United Front, by Dimitroff?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that is the most authoritative statement of the general line of the World Communist movement as formulated by the Seventh World Congress in 1935.

Mr. WHITLEY. I would also like to have that identified.

(The book above referred to was marked "September 5, 1939.  
Witness Browder, W. R. G.")

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, Dimitroff is the secretary of the executive committee of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right. He is general secretary of the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. His position with the Communist International corresponds to your position with the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And his book represents—it is the best representation of the present line of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. In its international phase: yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In its international phase?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, what are your own principal books or writings on the subject of communism?

Mr. CASEY. Before you go to that, may I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Is it pertinent, along the line of this testimony?

Mr. CASEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. CASEY. These various books that have been introduced in evidence as forming the basis of the Communist doctrine, is the Communist Party in America in substantial agreement with all of the various theories set forth in these books?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, there is no orthodoxy of communism, and all the literature of communism is taken not as orthodox formulas, but as guides to thought and action—guides to thought and action—which is applied not mechanically and not according to the letter, but according to the substance and the circumstances of each particular country.

Mr. CASEY. According to your definition—may I put it this way: Is there any substantial disagreement between anything that is set forth in the books that have been introduced in evidence?

Mr. BROWDER. Not of a principle character.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are your own principal writings on the subject to communism, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I have published four books: Communism in the United States, a collection of the reports, articles, and speeches in

the years 1933 and 1934; a book, What is Communism, which was published in the beginning of 1936; The People's Front, a collection of articles, reports, and speeches for 1936-37, published at the end of 1937 or the beginning of 1938; and the book, Fighting for Peace, a collection of my articles and speeches during 1938 and the beginning of 1939, having to do with the question of the foreign policy of the United States and the questions of peace and war.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about The Democratic Front; is that another of your works?

Mr. BROWDER. That is my report to the tenth convention of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. WHITLEY. And these writings represent the line of the Communist Party in the United States as interpreted by its official spokesman—yourself?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; and the largest part of the contents of these books have been officially endorsed by the Communist Party—not every detail, but the largest part.

Mr. WHITLEY. It represents, then, the authentic position—

Mr. BROWDER. I think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the line of the party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I would like to have those introduced, Mr. Chairman, into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; they will be marked as exhibits by the stenographer.

(The books above referred to were marked "September 5, 1939. Witness Browder. W. R. G.")

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, your pamphlet, The Democratic Front—does that represent the line, the present line of the Communist Party of the United States on the subjects which are covered therein?

Mr. BROWDER. It does.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, is the Communist Party of the United States affiliated with and a part of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party of the United States is affiliated with the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does it function under the constitution of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party of the United States never complied with the constitutional provisions of the Communist International on affiliation and the issue was never raised between us.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, you say that the Communist Party of the United States has never officially adopted the constitution?

Mr. BROWDER. And has not complied with its provisions.

Mr. WHITLEY. It has not complied with its provisions?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. If that is the case, Mr. Browder, then in what manner and on what terms did the Communist Party of the United States become officially affiliated?

Mr. BROWDER. The affiliation was first made at the time when the party was known as the Workers' Party of America. I cannot give you the exact date, but it is approximately 1923, or the end of 1922—

from a year to a year and a half after the formation of the Workers' Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did the Workers' Party, which was the forerunner of the present Communist Party in the United States, officially adopt or approve the constitution of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. It did not.

Mr. WHITLEY. It did not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Your affiliation, then, has not been formal; is that the understanding?

Mr. BROWDER. There are certain formal affiliations, yes, because we have participated in the international congresses; we have sent delegates to all of the international congresses since the third congress.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the fact that the C. P. U. S. A. has not officially approved or adopted the constitution of the Communist International has not in any way changed its status from any other Communist Party which has adopted it?

Mr. BROWDER. Politically; no. It was only on organizational questions that there was any ignoring of the constitution. Politically, there has been the closest collaboration, the closest relationship.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, your relationship to the Communist International was just the same as if there had been a formal approval of the constitution?

Mr. BROWDER. In its political essence, yes; in its organizational forms, no.

Mr. WHITLEY. You mean organizationally there is a variance?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. From the constitution of the international?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you point out those points of variance, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, for one thing, the Communist Party of the United States has never paid dues to the Communist International; it has not submitted regular reports, and so on.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those are requirements under the constitution?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of the international?

Mr. BROWDER. There are a series of such requirements under the constitution which have never been observed by us.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you point out some of the others, in addition to not paying dues and making regular reports?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Browder said he had not made regular reports. How often have they reported, and how often are they required to report?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, we have reported, in the period in which I can speak of my own personal knowledge, at the international congresses and conferences in person. Most of those since 1930 I have myself attended, and I have given oral reports to all of my associates of the other Communist Parties, both in personal conversations and in formal meetings of the Communist International. I have spoken about American conditions and problems, and tried to explain them and to make clear these problems and conditions, and also the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States to them.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Did the constitution require that you make any reports at various periods?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, the constitution requires that all the minutes and documents of affiliated parties should be sent to the headquarters of the Communist International. This we have never complied with, one of the reasons being, of course, not that we do not want them to have them, but we are so far away that communication is very difficult.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is the only reason?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; no political reason.

Mr. WHITLEY. To all intents and purposes, though, you are affiliated with the Communist International, just the same?

Mr. BROWDER. So far as the political essence of the problem is concerned, there is the closest harmony between the Communist Party of the United States and the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the Communist International itself has approved the affiliation?

Mr. BROWDER. Not formally; but by accepting the delegates of the party in its congresses.

Mr. WHITLEY. The fact it was not formal does not vary the relationship?

Mr. BROWDER. No. It becomes a question only if people begin to raise formal questions. If they are dealing with political questions, it does not become a question; if they are dealing with formal questions, it does.

Mr. THOMAS. Does that close harmony exist now that Mr. Stalin has signed up with Mr. Hitler?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't understand your question.

Mr. THOMAS. You said the closest harmony existed between the Communist Party in the United States and the Communist International. That is the statement you just made; is not that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true; is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. What I want to know is whether the closest harmony exists right today, now that Mr. Stalin has made his non-aggression pact with Mr. Hitler, that did not exist a few weeks ago?

Mr. BROWDER. I understand your question now. Yes. Yes; the closest harmony and agreement exists.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us proceed.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, is that a copy of the program of the Communist International and the statutes of the Communist International under which it presently operates [handing pamphlet to witness]?

Mr. BROWDER (after examination). No; this is the Sixth World Congress.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the program adopted at the Sixth World Congress.

Mr. BROWDER. At the Sixth World Congress.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. It is in force only as modified by the Seventh World Congress.

Mr. WHITLEY. What were those modifications; do you know?

Mr. BROWDER. The Seventh World Congress inaugurated the policy of the People's Front, which was a sharp turn in the political policy of the Communist Parties of the World.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, that was a radical departure from the program as outlined by previous congresses?

Mr. BROWDER. From the tactical phase; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have a copy of the program as adopted by the Seventh World Congress in 1935?

Mr. BROWDER. I could provide it for you. The resolution, you mean?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. You have the substance of it in the book you have already introduced.

Mr. VOORHIS. Now might I ask a question at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Is it pertinent?

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Browder, would you say that the only reason for the change in policy, so far as the Communist Party of the United States is concerned, from the policies followed previously, was on account of the new decisions and program adopted at the Seventh World Congress?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I would say nothing of the kind. I would say that the same forces that were operating in other Communist Parties of the world are operating in the United States, and we were independently coming to conclusions of a change in policy before the representatives of the various parties gathered in the Seventh World Congress. In fact, the Communist Party of the United States was one of those parties which took the initiative in beginning changes before the congress, in its own work, and raising the whole question at the Seventh World Congress and clarifying it for the Seventh World Congress.

Mr. VOORHIS. Supposing you had failed in the Seventh World Congress in putting your idea across, would you have been free to proceed along the lines that were actually adopted in the Seventh World Congress, in spite of the fact that the Seventh World Congress had decided against you?

Mr. BROWDER. If we had considered the question of sufficient importance that it was necessary to take a different line, then inevitably the conclusion would have been drawn that we would leave the Communist International. We do not believe in an international organization which continues to keep up a formula of international unity, in spite of a real lack of unity, and whenever we fundamentally disagree with a decision of the Communist International, we would withdraw from it.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, there has never been a fundamental disagreement?

Mr. BROWDER. There has not.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have always agreed fundamentally with the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. But that is purely a fortuitous circumstance? What I mean is, it has just happened that the Communist Party of the

United States just happened to agree with what the Communist International decided; is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. According to our understanding of history, nothing just happens; it happens according to certain laws, according to certain social and political developments.

The CHAIRMAN. You say this Seventh World Congress changed the policy or tactics of the Communist Party; is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. With reference to the People's Front?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That decision was that the Communist Party was to join hands with other organizations opposed to nazi-ism; is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And to form a People's Front, like in France—I believe it is called a People's Front there—and in other countries?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Where they would present a united front against nazi-ism?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the purpose—to present a solid front against nazi-ism?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; to prevent the destruction of democracy, opposed to fascism in all of its forms on every question.

Mr. STARNES. What were those organizations affiliated with or organized as a result of the Seventh World Congress to carry on the fight against nazi-ism and fascism throughout the world?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not say any particular organizations were formed as a result of the Seventh World Congress.

Mr. STARNES. Were organizations formed thereafter, Mr. Browder, for that purpose?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know of any.

Mr. STARNES. You do not know of any at all?

Mr. BROWDER. If you have reference to the American League Against War and Fascism, that was formed sometime before the Seventh World Congress.

Mr. STARNES. Was a report made of the doings of that league at the Seventh World Congress, and attention called to its work?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, sure. When I reported to the Seventh World Congress, I reported what I considered a very important and significant development in American political, civic, and economic life, including all of the political parties of America—a very significant reorganization. I tried to give a rounded-out picture of the developments in America.

The CHAIRMAN. You have answered the question.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, will you give us an outline of the administrative structure of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. The world congress is the supreme authority of the Communist International. It elects an executive committee composed of representatives of the most important parties affiliated to the Communist International. The executive committee, which meets only occasionally on call, elects a smaller committee to conduct the day-to-day business of the organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the name of that committee?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe it is called the secretariat.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what is the size of the executive committee of the Communist International, approximately?

Mr. BROWDER. Approximately, it is between 40 and 50 members.

Mr. WHITLEY. Between 40 and 50 members?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Selected by the world congress?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That congress being made up of Communist parties throughout the world?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the executive committee, in turn, selects a small group known as the secretariat?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which carries on the day-to-day business of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the organization of which he is a member?

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you a member of the executive committee?

Mr. BROWDER. I am a member of the executive committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you a member of the secretariat?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I am not.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many members comprise the secretariat?

Mr. BROWDER. I think there are some 10.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the small governing body?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not say governing body; I would say administrative body.

The CHAIRMAN. But they are subject to the executive committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Responsible to the executive committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where are those congresses held and when are they held. Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. The congresses are held in Moscow. That is not a constitutional provision, but it happens to be the only place where a world congress can be held.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is because the headquarters of the Communist International are there, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say the headquarters are there for the same reason.

Mr. WHITLEY. It just happens?

Mr. BROWDER. That is the only country that would permit the functioning of the International organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, it just happens to be in Moscow, for those reasons?

Mr. BROWDER. Again I would say I never can agree with the expression "just happens." When a thing happens, it happens because of certain laws.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you have explained that.

Mr. WHITLEY. If some other country would permit, the Communist International, the headquarters of the Comintern would be there?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. And I think the Communist International would welcome such a development.

Mr. WHITLEY. How often are congresses held in Moscow?

Mr. BROWDER. There is no stated period.

Mr. WHITLEY. There is no stated period?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just when called?

Mr. BROWDER. The last one was held in 1935.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who are the congresses called by?

Mr. BROWDER. The executive committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. They are called by the executive committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And when was the congress preceding the one in 1935?

Mr. BROWDER. 1928.

Mr. WHITLEY. In 1928?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. There was a lapse there from 1928 until 1935, when there was no World Congress?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. During which period the executive committee and the secretariat carried on the administrative functions of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now who are the members of this secretariat, Mr. Browder? Do you recall?

Mr. BROWDER. I can recall a few names; I am not certain I can recall them all. George Dimitroff, general secretary; Wilhelm Pieck—

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Dimitroff is a member of what Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. At the present time I think he is a citizen of the Soviet Union and a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He comes from Bulgaria.

Mr. WHITLEY. But he is a member of the Soviet Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. At the present time; yes—since his release from Germany. At the time of the Reichstag fire trial, he was gotten out of Germany by being made a citizen of the Soviet Union at that time.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now Mr. Pieck, another member of the secretariat: Of what Communist Party is he a member?

Mr. BROWDER. Pieck is a German.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is a member of the Germany party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he a German citizen?

Mr. BROWDER. According to the laws of Mr. Hitler, no.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he a Soviet citizen?

Mr. BROWDER. No; he is like so many Germans—a man without a country. He holds citizenship in the Communist Party of Germany.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you name the other members of the executive committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Maurice Thorez.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what party is he a member of?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party of France.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Communist Party of France?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he a citizen of France?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you name the others, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Ercoli—Alfred Ercoli, an Italian—again, a man denied his citizenship by the present regime in Italy.

Mr. WHITLEY. But not a Soviet citizen?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is a refugee from Italy?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Living in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just like Mr. Pieck is a refugee from Germany living in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right. And if you want a complete list, which I am sure I will not be able to give you from memory, perhaps you should allow me to get the records from New York on it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. I can give you a complete list of the secretariat of the Communist International.

Mr. STARNES. And let us know what country they come from.

Mr. WHITLEY. Give us the background.

Mr. BROWDER. The name and the country?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is right; their citizenship and the Communist Party they belong to; that is, what country.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

(The list referred to follows:)

MEMBERS OF THE SECRETARIAT, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL (AS ELECTED AT THE SEVENTH WORLD CONGRESS, 1935)

George Dimitroff, general secretary; M. Ercoli, D. Z. Manuilsky, Wilhelm Pieck, Otto Kuusinen, Andre Marty, Klement Gottwald.

*Candidate-members.*—M. Florin, M. A. Moskvin, Wang Ming.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, Mr. Browder, just to get a clear picture of the administrative or organizational set-up: The Comintern, or Communist International, at its World Congress, elects its program body, its governing body, its executive committee, then a small group known as the secretariat, which is the active functioning body?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now the Communist Party of the United States has its national conventions when called, and at the national convention selects the national committee, and the national committee, in turn, selects a small body known as the political committee?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is the active functioning group?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the same administrative structure extend to the district? The district has its convention, selects a district committee, and the district committee, in turn, has a smaller group?

Mr. BROWDER. It has an executive committee. In fact, you will find that the organizational principle in that respect, with delegates, committees, and so forth, is much the same as in every other similar body in the United States.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is uniform for the Communist International down to the smallest units of the party in the United States, in its administrative functions?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say that just now when he asked you the question. I understood you to say that.

Mr. BROWDER. I said that the organizational principles, with the delegation of authority by conventions, committees, and so forth, was practically the same as that for every political party in the United States. That is quite different from the question I said "no" to. There is no such uniformity in the Communist International as a whole, because each national Communist Party has its own supreme authority.

Mr. WHITLEY. I was referring to the administrative structure under which the party functions.

Mr. BROWDER. It will be very easy to draw a wrong conclusion from the form of the question, and I want to be as careful as I can.

Mr. STARNES. You gave us a moment ago the names of some of the members of the general secretariat that you could remember.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. In that connection, you made a very peculiar statement. You said that one of the members, Mr. Pieck, I believe, and Mr. Ercoli, an Italian—one a native German and the other an Italian—were denied citizenship by Hitler and Mussolini. Would you tell us why that was? Was it because of the commission of some crime, and so forth?

Mr. BROWDER. I think it is well known that Communists in those countries have been denied citizenship, have been executed, and in large numbers have been imprisoned in those countries.

Mr. STARNES. On what basis?

Mr. BROWDER. On the basis of the suppression of political rights. That applies not only to Communists but to all democratic organizations.

Mr. STARNES. It had nothing to do with race, religion, or color?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; it was political.

Mr. STARNES. It was purely political?

Mr. BROWDER. Purely political suppression.

Mr. WHITLEY. There are quite a few more questions I want to ask about the International.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we should adjourn now until 1:15 o'clock.  
(Thereupon the committee took a recess until 1:15 p. m.)

#### AFTER RECESS

(The committee resumed its session at 1:15 p. m.)

#### TESTIMONY OF EARL RUSSELL BROWDER—Resumed

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. You may proceed, Mr. Whitley.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you, or your organization, pledge loyalty to any foreign country at any time?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has this been the consistent attitude of both you and your organization from its beginning?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does your organization receive foreign subsidies of any kind?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is your organization connected in any way with any foreign agency which advocates those ideas?

Mr. BROWDER. Which ideas? I do not understand.

Mr. WHITLEY. The ideas of loyalty to a foreign country or receiving subsidies from them.

Mr. BROWDER. It does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. We were discussing the relation between the Communist Party of the United States and the Communist International, and you are explaining the administrative structure of the Communist International. Does the Communist Party of the United States have representatives to the Comintern or the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. We have delegates to the congresses and conferences of the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. As to delegates to conferences, is that just occasionally, or do you have them regularly?

Mr. BROWDER. Occasionally.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not have regular delegates or representatives assigned by the representatives of the C. P. U. S. A. to the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. The only type of representation you have from the C. P. U. S. A. to the Comintern is an occasional one, or to a congress or an occasional conference?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. There is no regular representative assigned to them?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir. There are a few Americans on the working staff of the Communist International, but they are not regularly assigned.

Mr. WHITLEY. As employees, but not as representatives of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; that is true.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the past, has any representative to the Comintern for any purpose, for conference purposes, or whatever the purpose was, as a visitor to the Comintern from the C. P. U. S. A., been known or designated by the name of Randolph?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; the name "Randolph" is the name of one of the comrades working there.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was that his real name, or a name that he assumed?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the only name you know him by?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know any other members of the C. P. U. S. A. who worked for or attended conferences of the Comintern and who used that name or was known by that name?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is Randolph still living in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. I think he is in the Soviet Union.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you furnish the names of the officials and members of the governing committees or groups of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe you stated this morning that you would give us the membership of the secretariat, and, also, of the executive committee.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are there any other groups or divisions there active in administrative affairs made up of representatives from foreign countries?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe they have what they call a presidium or presiding committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the function of that committee?

Mr. BROWDER. It is a small body that meets occasionally when it is impossible for the executive committee to meet as a whole. It takes up matters that ordinarily would go to the executive committee when the executive committee meets.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that a larger body than the secretariat?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is an intermediate body between the executive committee and the secretariat?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are any representatives of the Communist Party of the United States members of that group?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe that William Z. Foster is a member of it. I can confirm that positively later.

Mr. WHITLEY. A member of the presidium?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you let us know definitely about that?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; I believe that he is a member.

Mr. WHITLEY. That meets subject to call, or periodically?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; subject to call.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe you stated that you were a member of the executive committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long have you held that position?

Mr. BROWDER. Since 1935.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have any other members of the C. P. U. S. A. held positions on the executive committee, the presidium, or the secretariat?

Mr. BROWDER. At the present time there are four Americans on the executive committee: William Z. Foster, myself, James W. Ford, and Gilbert Green.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are they members of any of the other two groups, other than Mr. Foster?

Mr. BROWDER. I think not.

Mr. STARNES. Who is Gilbert Green?

Mr. BROWDER. He is president of the Young Communist League of the United States.

Mr. STARNES. What does he do? What is his business or affiliations? I am speaking now of his means of livelihood.

Mr. BROWDER. He is working for the Young Communist League. He came into that work as a student.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Communist Party of the United States contribute financially to the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. No contribution is made of any kind?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have already stated that it did not pay dues to the International?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; that is true.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Communist Party of the United States contribute financially to the Communist Party in other countries?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. To what parties and under what circumstances?

Mr. BROWDER. I can best answer that by giving concretely the financial assistance that we gave other parties in 1938: During 1938 our party, out of a fund which we collect from the membership called the international solidarity fund, contributed to or expended on behalf of the Communist Party of Germany \$6,400; to the Communist Party of Cuba, \$6,700; to the Communist Party of the Philippines, \$4,000; to the Communist Party of Mexico, \$2,264; to the Communist Party of Spain, \$5,500; to the Communist Party of China, \$1,600; to the Communist Party of Chile, \$1,400; to the Communist Party of Ireland, \$1,200; and to others in relatively small amounts.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the total of the contributions that you have mentioned?

Mr. BROWDER. \$36,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is, during 1938 the C. P. U. S. A. contributed \$36,000 to the Communist Party in the countries you have named?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who decides to what parties those contributions shall be made?

Mr. BROWDER. The financial committee of our party.

Mr. WHITLEY. That committee decides to whom contributions shall be made, and the amount of the contribution to be made?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the contributions are made out of what you call the solidarity fund?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. That fund is made up how?

Mr. BROWDER. From a financial assessment of the membership collected together with the dues, equal to 1 month's dues, three times a year.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has the C. P. U. S. A. ever contributed financially to the Communist Party of Soviet Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. They have made no contributions to that group?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. How are funds transmitted to those countries? Are they transmitted directly to the leaders in those countries?

Mr. BROWDER. Sometimes, as in the case of Ireland, we send them a postal money order. In most of the countries where we have given assistance there has been some difficulty in transmitting funds through the post office or banking channels, and it is sent through private individuals.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe we touched on this matter this morning, but I will ask the question again in case it was not fully answered: Do you make regular reports to the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; not in the sense of written reports. The Communist International receives, however, our publications, and is informed of our activities through our publications.

Mr. WHITLEY. Through your publications, and at the congress, you make a personal report?

Mr. BROWDER. When I am present. I have been in the last congresses.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you maintain contact with or make reports of any kind to the Communist International or to any foreign government, or through personal representatives?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not of any kind?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is there any written form or statement for the transfer of Communist Party members from one country to another?

Mr. BROWDER. Theoretically, it is provided for by the statutes of the Communist International, but in practice the Communist Party has not done such a thing for several years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you mean that they officially issued transfers to members from one government to another?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe it has been done; but for many years, since the world has become one of disorder, the Communist Party has refused to take transfers from one country to another by a form of transfer, and says that every individual who comes into the country must come on the basis of work and character. They do not take anybody on the basis of a form of transfer.

Mr. WHITLEY. When, to your knowledge, was the last transfer made of a member of the C. P. U. S. A. to another country?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that the last time I signed a transfer was about 1933.

Mr. WHITLEY. Such transfer was made by a form, when they were used?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. It was a notification that the person who held the transfer was a member of the party in this country and wanted to be a member of the party in the country to which he was going.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was in the form of a letter from you, as general secretary of the party in this country, to the head of the party in the country to which the member was going?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say, but I want to be quite sure, that no such transfer has been issued since 1933.

Mr. BROWDER. I think that is about the time I signed the last transfer.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like for him to be more positive about that. He said he "thinks."

Mr. WHITLEY. Such transfers would have to be signed by you?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. If you had signed any since 1933, you would know about it?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you state, to the best of your knowledge—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). To the best of my knowledge and belief, the last one was in 1933.

Mr. WHITLEY. The form of the transfer would be a letter, or in the form of a communication from you to the head of the party in the country to which the member was proceeding?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is there anything secret or underground about such transfers?

Mr. BROWDER. It depends on the country to which the persons are going. If they were going to a Fascist country, it would certainly be transmitted secretly.

Mr. WHITLEY. Suppose the party were going to Soviet Russia, would there be any attempt to conceal the documents transferring the party to that country?

Mr. BROWDER. It would depend on what countries he would be traveling through.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, there is such a secret method of transfer?

Mr. BROWDER. Whenever they are going to a Fascist country, everything connected with the Communist Party has had to be made secret.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is, Fascist and Nazi countries?

Mr. BROWDER. We use the term as a generic term.

Mr. WHITLEY. But only by those going to those countries?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Does that apply to every type of government, or does it just cover every type of government except the Communist form of government?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir. We understand by the Fascist type of government that which rules through a bloody dictatorship over the people, destroying all democratic organizations and every form of democracy.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you familiar with the pamphlet by O. Piatnitsky entitled "The Twenty-one Conditions of Admission Into the Communist International"?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do those conditions still apply?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; that document has been inoperative for many years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have supplementary conditions been issued to take the place of these conditions?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir. The whole problem that that was written to meet has disappeared from the Communist International. That was to meet problems in the formative period.

Mr. WHITLEY. As to those conditions, were they formally abandoned or repealed by the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; they were in practice relegated as anything would be. The publication of this document, or pamphlet, to which you refer, was one discussing whether those conditions should be revived, or not. Our decision was against it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Against revising it?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; and Mr. Piatnitsky is no longer in the membership of the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was his position at the time he wrote the pamphlet?

Mr. BROWDER. A member of the executive committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. A member of the executive committee, or the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. If there was a discussion, or if they proposed considering whether those conditions should be revived, it would imply that it had been formally revoked.

Mr. BROWDER. What took place was not a formal revocation, but to adopt a decision in the opposite direction.

Mr. WHITLEY. They have no application, then, today?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; they would have only historical interest.

Mr. WHITLEY. When and where have the congresses of the Communist International been held? Will you indicate each congress or conference?

Mr. BROWDER. The first congress was in March 1919, at Moscow. All the congresses have been held in Moscow. The second congress was in 1920. The month, I am not sure of. The third congress was in 1921, in June; the fourth congress was in 1922, and the fifth was in 1924. The month I am not sure about. The sixth congress was in the summer of 1928, and the seventh congress was in 1935, also in the summer.

Mr. WHITLEY. Under the original plan of operation, were the congresses supposed to be held periodically or at regular intervals?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe there were decisions generally to the effect that the congresses were to be held frequently in the early days, but that rapidly proved to be impracticable. Also, political congresses became less and less necessary with more normalism of world conditions during that period, and, also, with the stabilization of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Between 1928 and 1935, the years in which the sixth and seventh congresses were held, the entire Communist International was directed and administered by the executive committee, or by the smaller body, the presidium, and the Secretariat?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. There has not been one since 1935?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And only a world congress can outline the program for the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. No change in the program in the interim can be made until the next congress meets?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Communist Party of the United States receive any financial support from the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Nor from the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does it receive any financial assistance from the Communist Party in Soviet Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or from the Communist Party in any other country?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has it ever at any time in the past received any such financial support?

Mr. BROWDER. I cannot say positively that it has not. I do not know. I was speaking of the administration of the party since 1930.

Mr. WHITLEY. Since 1930, it has not?

Mr. BROWDER. It has not.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the relations between the Communist International and the Government of Soviet Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. There is no relationship.

Mr. WHITLEY. None whatever?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Either direct or indirect?

Mr. BROWDER. It depends on what you mean by indirect relationship. Men who occupy high office in the Government of Soviet Russia are also leaders in the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do officials of the Soviet Government exercise any direction or control over the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the membership of the Communist Party in Russia today?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe it is about three and a half million.

Mr. THOMAS. What was the approximate membership in Russia in 1919?

Mr. BROWDER. 1919 I believe it must have been about one and a half million.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the relations of the Communist Party of the United States with the Government of Soviet Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. There are no relations.

Mr. WHITLEY. There are no relations whatever?

Mr. BROWDER. None whatever.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say definitely that its relations with that government are the same as they would have with any other government that it might have contact with?

Mr. BROWDER. The form of your question makes it difficult to answer.

Mr. WHITLEY. Then I withdraw the question. I wanted a positive answer, and I think the committee should be given a positive answer. You say it has no connection or relation with it, directly or indirectly?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; it has not.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the relations between the Communist Party of the United States and the Communist Party in Soviet Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, generally it is on a fraternal basis, belonging to the same party.

Mr. WHITLEY. The relations of C. P. U. S. A. with the Communist Party in Soviet Russia are the same that the party in the United States would have with the Communist party in any other country?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Communist Party of the United States receive any financial assistance, direct or indirect, from the Soviet Government?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does it receive instructions or suggestions, directly or indirectly, from the Soviet Government?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the contacts or relations between the Communist Party in the United States and the Soviet Government officials in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. None whatever.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Soviet Government carry on propaganda activities of any kind in this country, to your knowledge?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Through any intermediaries?

Mr. BROWDER. Unless you could say that the Soviet Government's participation in the World's Fair is propaganda.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is the Communist Party of the United States registered with the State Department as a propaganda agency of a foreign power?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Soviet Government have leaders and officials of the Communist Party of the United States to make trips to Russia for the purpose of training them in propaganda activities?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Comintern or the Communist International give their members or officials of the party in the United States trips to Russia for the purpose of training them?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party of the United States has in the past through cooperation with the Communist International sent students to Russia, but there have been none sent for several years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you mean by cooperation financial assistance?

Mr. BROWDER. I mean that the Communist International maintained the students. The Communist Party of the United States sent them abroad.

Mr. WHITLEY. We will go into that in more detail. How many trips have you made to Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. I cannot say offhand, but very many.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give the dates of as many as you can, beginning with the first trip?

Mr. BROWDER. My first visit was in 1921. I was there in a union conference. I attended the Trade Union Conference. My next visit was in 1926, to a Trade Union Conference. I believe I have visited there almost at least once a year since then. My last visit was in 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the purpose of these later yearly visits?

Mr. BROWDER. Since 1930 I visited there because of my position as general secretary of the party, and a desire to confer with Communists in the Soviet Union and other countries.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have any of these trips been in connection with your position as a member of the executive committee of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; most of them.

Mr. WHITLEY. During those visits, or many of the visits to Soviet Russia, did you ever contact Mr. Stalin or other Soviet Government officials?

Mr. BROWDER. I met Mr. Stalin once, in 1926, personally, and that is the only time I ever spoke to him personally.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the occasion of that meeting?

Mr. BROWDER. We were both members of the same commission, and I was introduced to him.

Mr. WHITLEY. What commission was that?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know. I think it was a commission on China. It was some political discussion.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was not immediately prior to your trip to China?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Thereafter, I believe you said you made a trip to Africa?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you confer with him about that trip?

Mr. BROWDER. Not personally with him. I conferred with as many people as I could, but I did not have an opportunity to confer with him.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you have an opportunity to discuss with him party activities and the party program in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you pay your own expenses, or did the party pay your expenses, on these various trips to Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Since I have been general secretary of the party, the party has always paid my expenses.

Mr. WHITLEY. The party in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. The party in the United States; yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. They paid your expenses?

Mr. BROWDER. They paid my traveling expenses. My expenses in the Soviet Union were taken care of from the ruble fund from royalties, accumulated from my books and pamphlets.

The CHAIRMAN. It is difficult to hear what the witness is saying. What was his last statement?

Mr. WHITLEY. The last question was who paid Mr. Browder's expenses on his trips to Russia, and he said since he has been secretary the party pays his traveling expenses, and that his expenses there were paid from some fund.

Mr. BROWDER. Out of the proceeds of my writings published there.

Mr. STARNES. Published in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Published, sold, and circulated there?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Out of royalties that had accumulated there?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a bank account in Russia in which you place the money derived from the sale of your works in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not exactly a bank account. It is a fund from royalties on which I draw for expenses. From there I can draw out in rubles what is coming to me in royalties.

The CHAIRMAN. What publishing firm?

Mr. BROWDER. I really do not know. I could not give you the names offhand, because I deal with a representative.

The CHAIRMAN. They handle your works and you have an account there, and you go there and draw it out?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the only time you have received payments from the Soviet Union in United States money?

Mr. BROWDER. Until 1938 I never did, but in 1938 the newspaper Pravda began to send me the fees that they pay me for my articles to the United States in dollars. That is the first time I ever re-

ceived dollars from the Soviet Union. Moscow gold only comes in this form.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any arrangement similar to that in France?

Mr. BROWDER. In France? No.

The CHAIRMAN. No other country but the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. No other country but the Soviet Union.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Whitley, did I understand correctly that these are royalties from his books that have been sold by the Soviet Union?

Mr. WHITLEY. Royalties from his books that had been sold by the Soviet Union, as I understand.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. Would you not say that the payment of royalties was a capitalistic proceeding?

Mr. BROWDER. It is similar to the proceeding in capitalistic countries; yes.

Mr. STARNES. What is the Pravda?

Mr. BROWDER. The Pravda is the official newspaper of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I write for it quite regularly.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, has the Comintern or the Soviet Government ever defrayed any portion of your expenses on these trips to Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Not as secretary of the Communist Party; no.

Mr. WHITLEY. You mean that prior to the time you were secretary they did defray some of your expenses?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, the Comintern, when I was acting as their delegate in the funeral train of Henri Barbusse, paid all expenses.

Mr. WHITLEY. When you attend the world congresses of the Communist International, your traveling expenses are paid by the party in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. By the party in this country.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not by the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Nor by the Soviet Government?

Mr. BROWDER. In the course of congresses, while the congress is on, the Communist International itself provides meals and so on at the congress, in connection with the congress. That is the Communist International, and presumably the Communist Party of the Soviet Union paid my expenses by giving me my meals in the congress.

Mr. WHITLEY. Aside from that, the Communist International does not defray any portion of your expenses?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me understand that part. You say the Communist Party provides your subsistence while you are attending your congresses?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Soviet Union, in turn, supplies the international with funds for that purpose?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I said nothing of that kind. I said presumably the Party of the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you mean by that phrase?

Mr. BROWDER. I mean I did not know what the detailed arrangements were, but I presume that the Communist Party of the Soviet

Union, through its dues and payments to the Communist International, had provided the funds whereby the Communist International maintained its congress.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I see; all right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, is the Communist Party of the United States in any way connected with Soviet espionage, either military or political, in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Soviet Government contribute financially to the support of the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Soviet Government exercise any control over the Comintern, financially or in matters of policy?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, do you know about the Lenin School in Moscow.

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many students does the Communist Party of the United States send there each year?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not send any.

Mr. WHITLEY. It does not send any?

Mr. BROWDER. No; it has not for many years.

Mr. WHITLEY. It has not for many years?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do members of the Communist Party in the United States attend that school?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. They do not attend it?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Either on their own expense or at the instance of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. Not in any way that I know of.

Mr. WHITLEY. You said a moment ago that the party in this country had not sent students for many years. How far back, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe that the last time there were American students there was in 1933.

Mr. WHITLEY. 1933; and since that time the party as such has not sent any students there?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And no members of the party have gone there as students?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. During the period that the students or members of the C. P. U. S. A. did attend the Lenin school, who paid their expenses?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party of the United States paid their traveling expenses, and the Communist International maintained the school.

Mr. WHITLEY. Maintained the school and took care of their subsistence while they were attending school?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Whitley, will you determine why that practice was discontinued?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; I will, Mr. Thomas.

How long had that practice continued prior to 1933, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not certain. I found that practice going on when I became the general secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you discontinued it?

Mr. BROWDER. I was one of those who brought about its discontinuance.

Mr. WHITLEY. And why was it discontinued, Mr. Browder.

Mr. BROWDER. For a variety of reasons. In the first place, we found that the type of teaching that was being received there by Americans was not of the best, and, as we subsequently found out, this was due to the influence of certain enemy forces that had penetrated into the teaching staff of the school—Trotskyites and Bukharinites.

Mr. STARNES. What is that last name again?

Mr. BROWDER. Trotskyites and Bukharianites. The names are derived from Leon Trotsky and Nicolai Bukharin, who were exposed as enemies of communism and enemies of the Soviet Union.

The second reason why we discontinued sending students was because we came to the conclusion that it was not good for students to be so long away from America; it was not good for them to be so long away from their home. They have a tendency to become denationalized, and our whole policy and our whole effort was to make our membership more American, more conscious of America's problems and more deeply immersed in America. We decided, therefore, that the education of them abroad was a bad thing, and we discontinued it.

Mr. STARNES. Do you educate them at home now, or have you since that time?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you educate them in your own schools?

Mr. BROWDER. We have a national training school in New York.

Mr. THOMAS. How many students do you have at that school?

Mr. BROWDER. It varies from year to year; sometimes 25, sometimes 50.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the term of the course?

Mr. BROWDER. Six months.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you any other schools in the United States besides that one?

Mr. BROWDER. That is the only full-time training school of the university type. We have many of the more elementary schools.

Mr. THOMAS. How many elementary schools have you in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. I have not the statistics available. We have the workers' school in New York City, which enrolls many thousands of students in evening classes.

Mr. THOMAS. What do you teach in those classes?

Mr. BROWDER. Economics, history, Communist theory, public speaking, languages, literature, and so on.

Mr. THOMAS. Various forms of political philosophy?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Approximately how many of those workers' schools does the party maintain throughout the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say at least a dozen.

Mr. WHITLEY. At least a dozen in the larger cities?

Mr. BROWDER. In the larger cities; yes—mostly evening classes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where are they located, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland—

Mr. WHITLEY. Pittsburgh?

Mr. BROWDER. Pittsburgh had one, but I think it is closed now.

Mr. WHITLEY. It has reopened again, I believe.

Mr. BROWDER. It may be. San Francisco—

Mr. WHITLEY. Los Angeles?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not certain about Los Angeles; I think there is a school there—and Seattle.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those are the ones you recall?

Mr. BROWDER. Those are the ones I recall; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you determine what is the annual attendance at all those schools, Mr. Whitley?

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give us the figure of the total attendance of all the schools, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not with any claim to accuracy, but just as a rough estimate I would say that perhaps as many as 25,000 students attend classes in one form or another in the course of a year.

Mr. STARNES. Do any of these students or these people who are former students engage in teaching work in some of our schools and colleges throughout the country?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I think it would be more accurate to say that sometimes those whose profession is already teaching in the public schools attend the classes of our schools. Not so often do we have graduates of our schools themselves, on the basis of that, becoming professional teachers later.

Mr. STARNES. That applies to colleges and universities also, as well as public schools, does it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I mean the colleges and universities also.

Mr. STARNES. Is Columbia one of them?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I am sure it is.

Mr. STARNES. Harvard?

Mr. BROWDER. I am sure that there are at least a dozen universities which have had people come to attend our workers' schools. There is quite an interest in these workers' schools in the educational field.

Mr. STARNES. Suppose we get that for the record. Columbia has some of them; Harvard has some of them?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I can't say positively. Harvard has had one of our most distinguished Communist educators as some sort of a fellowship there—Mr. Granville Hicks.

Mr. STARNES. How about City College?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not at all sure about that. I know that there are many students of City College who have attended the workers' schools—night classes, I will say.

Mr. STARNES. What about Minnesota—the University of Minnesota?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with the conditions there.

Mr. STARNES. Go ahead and give us the names, then; because you said there were at least a dozen. Please give us for the record some of these other schools.

Mr. BROWDER. I think that in every city where we have a worker's school you will find students from the university attending these schools.

Mr. STARNES. All right; presumably then, you have members of the faculty in the University of Chicago?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I am not speaking of the faculties. I said from the universities.

Mr. STARNES. But you have members of the faculties of some of the universities, do you not, who teach communism?

Mr. BROWDER. We sometimes get lectures from faculty members of the universities, but never regular teaching courses.

Mr. STARNES. What I am driving at is, are not these professors who give these lectures on these subjects in your own schools also teaching those subjects in other schools and colleges?

Mr. BROWDER. No; not the same.

Mr. STARNES. Not the same?

Mr. THOMAS. Would Brooklyn College be one of those that you have mentioned?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes: I think we have some in Brooklyn College, also.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, you have representatives of the Communist Party in all vocations of life; you have some professional men, doctors and lawyers, and you have the middle class of people, and it is a cross section of the entire country?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right, although the majority of them are workers in the industries. But we have also members from all walks of life.

The CHAIRMAN. All walks are represented in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think we will have any trouble in getting the membership from the branches for the inspection of the committee, so that the committee can inspect it?

Mr. BROWDER. I think the only possibility of trouble would be where a branch might suspect that it would be used for purposes of discrimination in jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be the only objection that could be heard?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But you yourself would advise them to give the committee full access to them?

Mr. BROWDER. Wherever this element of risk of livelihood is not involved; yes.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, do you have any organizations for the housewives?

Mr. BROWDER. No separate organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, to be a student in one of the workers' schools, does a person have to be a member?

Mr. BROWDER. No. In fact, most of the students are not members.

Mr. STARNES. Are they adults?

Mr. BROWDER. Mainly.

Mr. WHITLEY. And who are the teachers in these various workers' schools that you have named, and which the party maintains? Who are the instructors?

Mr. BROWDER. These schools that the party supports, of course, are independent associations, and the party merely influences them as it influences other organizations. For the purpose of helping to guide the work of these schools, we have school commissions, who help to work out the curricula and select the teaching staff.

Mr. WHITLEY. And from what classes are the teaching staffs selected? Are they members or officials of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that in the workers' schools there is probably 60 or 70 percent party members, but as much as one-third may be nonparty.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are they especially trained to perform those teaching duties?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, we often have special teachers' courses during the summer to prepare teachers for the winter school work.

Mr. WHITLEY. And in addition to the workers' schools you have the institution of higher training, the university which is maintained in New York City?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the only difference between that and the workers' schools being that the course of instruction is more advanced?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And it is a regular full-time school?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And all of these schools are under the immediate direction of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. We have a school committee that guides them as much as possible. The National Training School is a regular institution of the party. The others are not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is the head of that school committee, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. The head of the school committee is a comrade who just died the other day—Abraham Markoff. He died of a sudden heart attack just last week.

Mr. WHITLEY. And he has not been replaced?

Mr. BROWDER. He has not been replaced yet.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a thing that I want to clarify. We have been questioning here at some length. What is the purpose of the Communist Party—the ultimate purpose in the United States? It is to bring about communism in the country, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. The ultimate, or final goal—

The CHAIRMAN. The ultimate, or final goal, the reason you are organized, and the reason you are working on this thing, is eventually to build up a Communist State in the United States, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. We want to see the time when America will have all of its industries, its economic life, and the property of all the people as a whole, together.

The CHAIRMAN. That is it: Government ownership, or abolition of private property?

Mr. BROWDER. In the means of production and distribution; not the abolition of private property in the means of consumption.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. But that is the real purpose of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is the ultimate aim.

The CHAIRMAN. Without that, there would not be any reason for its existence?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; we would be in some other kind of organization. Without this goal, we would want, for example, to establish socialism as the first stage of communism.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but what I mean is, without that, there would be no reason for communism to exist?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right. That is the main objective.

The CHAIRMAN. Really, the aim of your tactics, your strategy and everything else is to bring about socialism in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Not necessarily. It must be in harmony with our aim to bring about socialism, but also, while we are Communists, we are citizens, and we share many aims with the majority of the people, and, therefore, as a party, we also do things which—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). But your primary objective is to establish communism in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. As a party, that is the primary end.

The CHAIRMAN. And that being true, you support every movement which you think tends in that direction, do you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Not only that—

The CHAIRMAN. But is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. That is a part of the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. But that is true, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. That is true as far as it goes: yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean you are naturally sympathetic with any group or movement which tends toward communism?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what is the rest of the truth?

Mr. BROWDER. The rest of the truth is that we share many of the objectives of those who are not Communists and who are not Socialists, but who want things that we also want.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, who agree with you in part?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; on things which are not directly related to socialism.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, if someone agrees with you on part of your program, you go along with him to that extent?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But it is correct to say that your fundamental purpose is to establish communism in the United States, and that you naturally encourage and support every movement that tends in that general direction?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. In that connection, how do you distinguish between the Trotskyites and the Stalinites?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, we have had many years of learning to distinguish a Trotskyite, so that we have got so sensitive to the question that we can almost smell them when we get in the same room with a Trotskyite.

Mr. THOMAS. On the basis that you can smell a Republican?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, it is not so easy to smell a Republican, always. Sometimes Republicans and Democrats are indistinguishable. But Trotskyites and the so-called Stalinist Communists are not indistinguishable. They are quite distinct and separate political animals.

Mr. STARNES. Now give us the distinction; because I had the same question to ask you that the chairman asked, for you to define Communism and what your aim is. You have done that. Now I want the distinction between the two, because each claims that he is the true Communist. What is the distinction?

Mr. BROWDER. The distinction is that in every practical issue of the day you always find Trotskyites doing everything possible to prevent the accomplishment of whatever the Communist Party is trying to do, no matter what it may be. Their one function in the political life of this and every other country is to block and to wreck the work of the Communist Party. It is a specialized organization for that one purpose.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, the objective which you stated a moment ago of the Communist Party is real communism, and it is the so-called Stalinite doctrine of communism; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. We call it Marxism and Leninism.

Mr. STARNES. Now, then, the Trotskyites are diametrically opposed, we will say, to everything that Marxism and Leninism and the Stalinite Communists stand for; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Well, just what do they stand for? I do not get the distinction yet, Mr. Browder. I am sincere about this. Just in what way? Do they give you another movement? Do they have a program of their own which they offer in contradistinction to your program, or is it just mere blind opposition?

Mr. BROWDER. They have no formulated program, and they change their position on issues from week to week and from year to year with great facility. Trotskyism has no definite program. Always concretely, it expresses itself in a program of the moment, a program of action to counter and defeat the program of the Communists, the Communist Party, as well as the broad democratic movement. For example, at the present moment in American political life the main purpose of the Trotskyites today is to try to make it appear to the country, for example on the unemployed relief issue, that the main enemy of the unemployed is the President, and that the President is responsible for the present difficulties they are going through. The Communist Party, on the contrary, has supported the efforts of the President to get a decent W. P. A. program, and while they do not think he goes nearly far enough to meet the situation, they explain to the masses that the President is not responsible for the break-up and sabotage of the relief program of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. How far do you want to go on this?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not want to be in the position of refusing to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. On the other hand, there is bound to be some end to it.

Mr. BROWDER. That is up to you.

Mr. STARNES. Who is the leader of the so-called Trotsky faction in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. There is a multitude of them.

Mr. STARNES. Name some of them.

Mr. BROWDER. There is the so-called Socialist Workers' Party. There are many different leaders, people who used to be in the Communist Party but who were driven out 11 years ago.

Mr. STARNES. Who drove them out?

Mr. BROWDER. The membership of the party.

Mr. STARNES. Name some of those men.

Mr. BROWDER. James P. Cannon, Max Shachtman, Martin Abern. These are the names I am most familiar with.

Mr. STARNES. Have you not what you call Lovestoneites in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. That is a branch of the general camp of Trotskyites. You really have to draw a map if you want to follow all of the intricacies of this group. The Lovestoneites are a separate group.

Mr. STARNES. They were all at one time recognized as Communists, even by those who drove them out; is not that true?

Mr. BROWDER. They are groups that originated as groups within the Communist Party, and they were driven out.

Mr. STARNES. What is the distinction between socialism and communism?

Mr. BROWDER. That is a problem which has to be answered on two planes, one on the plane of political theory and the other on the plane of practical politics, as expressed in two parties.

The CHAIRMAN. Theoretically they are the same?

Mr. BROWDER. In the field of theory, socialism is the first stage of the development of communism.

Mr. STARNES. Whatever it is called, it ends in the same thing?

Mr. BROWDER. In the field of practical political action most people, when they think of the difference between the two parties are thinking about the difference between the Socialist Party and the Communist Party. There you are on an entirely different plane of question, because there is no difference—

Mr. STARNES. Except in practice.

Mr. BROWDER. Just a difference of opinion as to how socialism shall be brought about.

Mr. MASON. And the approach to the ultimate objective?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Then in the approach to the ultimate objective, what is the final distinction between them?

Mr. BROWDER. Between the two parties?

Mr. STARNES. That is right.

Mr. BROWDER. The main distinction as it presents itself in the United States today is that the Communist Party says the best way to contact the masses of this country by socialism—and it is a long job, far from being done—is to do everything possible to help the progressive democrats—with a small “d”—generally democratically minded people, to achieve their immediate objectives, and thereby establishing sympathetic proof that they have the opportunity to lead their minds to that legitimate argument for socialism.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us see if we can understand it, broken down into plain English.

Mr. BROWDER. I thought it was plain.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not saying that sarcastically. What you mean is this, that your idea of the way to bring about communism is to support every communistic plan or scheme proposed by other groups for the time being.

Mr. BROWDER. I go much further than that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you go that far?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I have to go that far in order to get further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Communist Party says that the way to bring about communism ultimately is to support communistic or socialistic measures that are proposed by other groups at the present time.

Mr. BROWDER. And even to support the simplest progressive measures.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything that tends in the general direction of Government ownership of industries?

Mr. BROWDER. Not always that, but everything that tends to help improve the conditions of the majority of the people.

Mr. STARNES. How far will you go in that direction, as a party? That is a practical question.

Mr. BROWDER. How far we will go we demonstrated in the 1938 elections in New York State, where it was Communist votes that prevented New York from having a Republican governor and enabled them to have a Labor-Democratic governor instead.

Mr. STARNES. How far will you go in reaching your objectives, only through the use of the ballot?

Mr. BROWDER. That is another question.

Mr. STARNES. I beg your pardon.

Mr. BROWDER. I misunderstood your question.

Mr. STARNES. Is that as far as you will go with the use of the ballot?

Mr. BROWDER. We think that the ballot is one of the most valuable instruments of political action ever devised by man, and it must be used to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. STARNES. If that fails, what will you do?

Mr. BROWDER. That is a question that has to be decided by the majority of the people when they face a real failure of the ballot.

Mr. STARNES. When it has broken down, what has been substituted?

Mr. BROWDER. If the ballot should break down, and if it failed it would mean it did not bring what people wanted, because the test of whether the ballot breaks down or does not is whether it gives the people the chance to express their will, whatever it may be. If the ballot breaks down, no one can give any guaranty what will come after. That is one reason why we have got to have this development of progressive democracy because we do not know what will come after it.

Mr. STARNES. If democracy has broken down, force will be substituted?

Mr. BROWDER. Inevitably.

Mr. STARNES. If the ballot fails, then it is force without limit until your objectives are obtained?

Mr. BROWDER. Force, in present conditions, is very bad for Communists, because it is largely used against us.

Mr. STARNES. It was used initially to obtain the success it did obtain; is not that right?

Mr. BROWDER. In the same sense that it was used to establish the United States.

Mr. STARNES. You used it that way in Europe in the beginning?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; and the American democracy was established by force.

Mr. STARNES. You think communism and democracy are synonymous?

Mr. BROWDER. Not synonymous, but related.

Mr. STARNES. One believes in private capital and the other does not; is that where you draw the distinction?

Mr. BROWDER. That is the difference; and the point where they are related is that both are based upon the basis of the rule of the majority, the rule of the people.

Mr. THOMAS. If you should gain your objective, if you should be successful in bringing about a communist state in the United States, would there be any private ownership of property at all?

Mr. BROWDER. According to my theory, yes; and according to the theory of my party, there would be private property in everything that had to do with private consumption; there would be no private property in the national economy, in the means of production, in production industries and factories, railroads and banks.

Mr. THOMAS. And farms.

Mr. BROWDER. As to agriculture, we think we should deal with that separately.

Mr. THOMAS. So the Government would own all of the factories?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; the whole productive economy of the country, except farms.

Mr. THOMAS. They would not own the farms?

Mr. BROWDER. Our program would call for the nationalization of land; the Government would own the land, but the actual agricultural processes of production would be organized according to the desires of the farmers themselves, therefore providing for the fullest possible development of agricultural production.

Mr. THOMAS. At the present time in this country many individuals have small businesses, some of those businesses in their homes. In view of that, would they be allowed to own that property where they conducted their own businesses?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Does not that program of yours drastically differ from the program of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Take the situation in Soviet Russia.

Mr. BROWDER. The program of the Communist International is a program of socialism of the means of production; that is, as to socially used means of production which can be provided through the production of one individual isolated, there is no sense in socializing it.

Mr. THOMAS. Does not that differ from the program of the Communist Party in Soviet Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. There are many differences in detail, but we say America is not Russia.

Mr. THOMAS. What I am trying to bring out is in Soviet Russia the government owns all of the property.

Mr. BROWDER. Not all of it; the productive property—

Mr. THOMAS. A person cannot own his own home there.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; you can.

Mr. THOMAS. They can?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one thing I wanted to clarify, and that is this: You stated a few minutes ago that the one consummation you desired more than anything is a Communist state in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You think that is the only final solution for our problems?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Feeling that way, you naturally encourage and support movements that you think tend in that direction; you made that clear.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that the only conditions favorable for communism are chaos and absolute conditions of poverty and unrest throughout the land. Is not that the only condition out of which communism has ever arisen?

Mr. BROWDER. No: that is a very serious simplification which gives a wrong picture.

The CHAIRMAN. You could not go to power during a prosperous period.

Mr. BROWDER. No: if the present system could operate to the satisfaction of the majority of the people, normally there would be no room for a socialistic system.

The CHAIRMAN. So the only chance for communism would be to have chaotic conditions in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What other conditions would promote or make possible the establishment of communism?

Mr. BROWDER. In order for communism to win the support of the majority of the people, it must prove to the people not only that the existing system is breaking down, but not that the Communists are responsible for this existing system. For that reason the Communist Party cannot be for the break-down, for chaos and disorder.

The CHAIRMAN. But the break-down has to be shown to the people before they would embrace communism.

Mr. BROWDER. But it has to be apparent that the break-down comes from the capitalists.

The CHAIRMAN. So, they would insist, would they not, that where the break-down of the economic system now existing occurs, that they place the blame upon the capitalists?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. So therefore when you said you joined movements to help the majority of the people, and joined movements for the benefit of the majority of the people to gain your objective, you would be going directly opposite to communism?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And yet you say you join movements to help the majority of the people.

Mr. BROWDER. We must do everything possible to help the majority of the people, or there will be no socialism, there will be only fascism.

The CHAIRMAN. Even if you are going in the opposite direction from communism.

Mr. BROWDER. I believe everything we can do to help improve the conditions of the majority of the people will help us win them to socialism.

The CHAIRMAN. But you just said there had to be a break-down, and you hoped to convince the people that the break-down was due to capitalists.

Mr. BROWDER. We are also convinced that we must not bring the break-down ourselves. We are quite confident that the capitalists will do the job themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. You know the break-down is coming eventually.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; but not by our work.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you are trying to prevent the break-down?

Mr. BROWDER. We are trying to prevent the break-down.

The CHAIRMAN. In doing that you are actually operating against the object, or preventing the achievement of the object of communism.

Mr. BROWDER. That is the argument of the Trotskyites.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that your argument?

Mr. BROWDER. That is not our argument. I think that answers also a previous question, what is the difference between the Communists and the Trotskyites, and disposes of the belief that the Communists are working for chaos and disorder.

The CHAIRMAN. But as a matter of common sense, you admit, and you say very plainly, that there must be a chaotic condition before communism can ever come about, and yet you are placing yourself in the attitude of trying to prevent it?

Mr. BROWDER. No; in fact, I think the most favorable condition is not chaos, but an orderly transition.

The CHAIRMAN. A gradual process; is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. An orderly transition, just as orderly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. A gradual socialism?

Mr. BROWDER. The more chaos there is the more chance there is for fascism instead of socialism.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore, your idea is that gradual socialism is the program for America?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know how gradual, but I would say that we cannot, perhaps, evolve the majority of the people and have them ready for socialism, and do it overnight. I would propose first the socialization of trustified industries.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the reason you would favor gradual socialistic measures, including the ownership of railroads; you support everything in that direction?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; but we do not expect a great deal to be accomplished by moves in connection with isolated industries. But I think the economic conditions of the country would enable us to take over the trustified industries of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. All overnight?

Mr. BROWDER. Not overnight, because in the basic industries of the country you can hardly operate very long with part socialism and part capitalism.

Mr. STARNES. The only thing that would contribute to the break-down of the present form of government would be to bankrupt that government and financially undermine the present system.

If it became bankrupt, and you destroyed it, there would have to be some other system substituted.

Mr. BROWDER. I think there is a certain surface plausibility to that.

Mr. STARNES. Then you would have to go to communism or fascism, if this type of government should break down; is not that right?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. So you would be willing to support any type of movement which would destroy the faith and credit of the Government from a financial standpoint to bring about that break-down so that a socialistic government might be substituted therefor; is that true?

Mr. BROWDER. No; that is not true.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Browder, you spoke a while back about the time when the ballot might break down. Is there any real reason why the ballot, used by the people to express a majority will in a country—is there any real reason why that should break down, provided you have a healthy condition in the country?

Mr. BROWDER. Our difficulty in the United States is that we have not a very healthy condition in the country. We have the largest part of the economy of the country in the hands of a very undemocratic group, a small fraction of the population. Any time they decide to use this economic power to breakdown the power of the ballot, I am afraid the ballot would be seriously endangered.

Mr. VOORHIS. Do you or do you not believe that it is possible for the power of that very small group to be so mitigated in the protection of a majority of the people, through democratic action, as to prevent it from being used to prevent the welfare of the people being served?

Mr. BROWDER. I think everything possible should be done in that direction.

Mr. VOORHIS. You believe it can be accomplished?

Mr. BROWDER. I think so; but I would not want to guarantee that it would be possible.

Mr. VOORHIS. As a matter of fact, is it not true that according to your philosophy, you do not believe it is possible?

Mr. BROWDER. No; our philosophy does not exclude it, but our philosophy emphasizes the danger that it will not be done.

Mr. VOORHIS. Assuming sincerity on the part of certain people who endeavor, to the best of their ability to maintain freedom, in the large sense of that word, and at the same time to establish justice for the great mass of people of America, and assuming they are successful in that effort, then, as a matter of fact, would it not be true that there would be no place for the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right: if the people in trying to solve these problems by whatever means are successful, they will make the Communist Party unnecessary.

Mr. VOORHIS. Is it not true that the very presence of two rival movements, one at either end of what one might call the scale of political philosophies, each of them saying, "We do not want to use violence, but will if necessary," makes more likely the break down of the ballot and the failure of these efforts to bring about a solution of the economic problem without any such break-down?

Mr. BROWDER. If you mean one of these is the Communist movement, you do not describe it correctly, because we are not making any threats of violence whatever.

Mr. VOORHIS. Supposing that it should turn out that you were successful and you did establish a Communist government in America, is it or not true that you would require a dictatorial government to carry out the program you mentioned when the chairman was questioning you?

Mr. BROWDER. Only in the scientific sense that we consider as a matter of political theory that every government is a dictatorship of some kind. But in the popular sense in which it is used in the newspapers in referring to a dictator government, we are absolutely opposed to every form of that.

Mr. VOORHIS. Do you believe you can take over all these trustified industries without it?

Mr. BROWDER. The argument that that is impossible is the argument of a large group, that industry can only be run by a dictatorship, and that it is better to have a private dictator than a public dictator. I do not believe that if the will of a majority of the American people be made up—that if a majority of the American people ever made up their minds—I do not believe the American people finally will believe it is better to have a private dictator than a public dictator in industry.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Browder, assuming you were in control of the United States, would you be ready to permit the people to oppose the program freely, and generally to enjoy the ordinary rights of civil liberty?

Mr. BROWDER. Surely.

Mr. VOORHIS. Why has not that been done in the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. It was done.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it now?

Mr. BROWDER. There were quite a number of political groups outlawed into the Soviet Union; these are the ones that make complaints and have political discussions, and you may ask the question, Why were they outlawed? They were outlawed only after they took up arms and tried to overthrow the Government. For the same reason that any group would be outlawed in the United States that would take up arms against the American Government. It would be outlawed, and that would be the proper democratic course to take.

Mr. VOORHIS. Would it be possible, under the circumstances, for any movement that would command a majority of the people of America, by an ordinary election, to unseat Communist control?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that socialism or communism never can be brought about in the United States unless it has such a support of the majority, such strong support that no election could defeat it, because if socialism or communism was to be tried and then to be defeated and be tried again and defeated, then you would have nothing but chaos in the country, and therefore it would not be correct to try to establish socialism until you had a majority behind it.

Mr. VOORHIS. Why not take the ground that one never should use any other method but the ballot to accomplish that because the ballot is the only way for indicating that a majority of the people are of a certain opinion?

Mr. BROWDER. One could hardly take the stand in Germany today that one would never use anything but the ballot.

Mr. VOORHIS. The time is past for that possibility, and it has also passed in the Soviet Union, has it not?

Mr. BROWDER. No; they are also making progress by the use of the ballot.

Mr. STARNES. How many elections have they held in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Many.

Mr. STARNES. Did they hold an election in 1919?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. They held a popular election?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; in 1917, 1918, and 1919.

Mr. STARNES. Have they held one since then?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; innumerable ones.

Mr. STARNES. How many people live in the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. One hundred and seventy million.

Mr. STARNES. What is the dominant political party?

Mr. BROWDER. The party with the overwhelming majority behind it is the Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. You stated this morning that there are 3,500,000 members of the Communist Party in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Three and a half million, and yet they control the country.

Mr. BROWDER. The best way to answer that question is to ask how many members there are of the Democratic Party in the United States.

Mr. MASON. Too many.

Mr. VOORHIS. Is there an opposition party in the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. That is another question, also. There have been innumerable opposition parties.

Mr. VOORHIS. What has happened to them?

Mr. BROWDER. They tried to make revolutions with a minority of the people behind them, and what happens to them will happen to everybody of that kind.

Mr. VOORHIS. In other words, they have no ordinary method of using the ballot to carry out their program?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; they have full use of the ballot. They were not satisfied with it.

Mr. VOORHIS. Are there organized parties in the Soviet Union that can carry on political activities?

Mr. BROWDER. There is not.

Mr. STARNES. In how many countries on this earth is the Communist Party dominant today?

Mr. BROWDER. Only the Soviet Union.

Mr. STARNES. It was established by force and maintained in that way?

Mr. BROWDER. It was established as every government in the world was established, without exception. There is not a single government in the world—

Mr. STARNES. It was established by force, of course.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; the same as the United States and every other government.

Mr. STARNES. By the slaying of the then rulers of that country.

Mr. BROWDER. Just the same as the United States was established.

Mr. STARNES. There was nobody in the United States slain; no rulers were slain in the United States.

Mr. BROWDER. I beg your pardon; my reading of history is different.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me we are getting into a discussion of American history.

Mr. BROWDER. Canada was very largely populated by the Loyalists who fled from the United States.

Mr. CASEY. As I understand you, if you have chaos, say, to the extent that existed in Germany before Hitler came into power, that condition would not be conducive to communism coming into power, but would be conducive to a strong man setting up a dictatorship because of the very dissatisfaction and discontent existing?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; if you have that condition.

Mr. CASEY. The second proposition is this: Assuming that you do have millions of unemployed men and millions of men underpaid and overworked through long hours, without a breakdown such as you had in Germany, would not that situation be more conducive to communism coming into rule?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; it would be much more so, because the normal conditions for the Communist Party work, is to be working among employees who are dissatisfied.

Mr. CASEY. Let me follow that with another step: Assuming that the unemployment problem is taken care of and the people are getting decent living wages and that the country is operating so that a vast majority of the people are happy, economically; would not that be a preventive to the establishment of communism?

Mr. BROWDER. It would make our growth slower. But I think the Communist movement would grow quicker because it has in it an intellectual appeal.

Mr. CASEY. That is all that would be left.

Mr. BROWDER. It would be merely an appeal to intelligence.

The CHAIRMAN. In that connection, as I understand you, the reason you are supporting these measures that have to do with unemployment, and so forth, is to prevent conditions that would be necessary for the establishment of communism?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You are really working against communism.

Mr. BROWDER. No; I am working against fascism.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not see the consistency of your logic. On the one hand you say that these progressive measures which have been enacted, such as unemployment relief, are things that your party is supporting in the United States, which makes it very difficult for communism to get a foothold.

Mr. BROWDER. No; it does not make it difficult.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not just say that the only other appeal would be an intellectual appeal?

Mr. BROWDER. But that is a very strong appeal in the United States, and I think the Communist movement would grow under the most healthy conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. You think that under prosperous and healthy conditions you will continue to grow on account of that intellectual appeal; that is, the appeal to the professors?

Mr. BROWDER. And to workers. I do not agree that only professors can be reached by the intellectual appeal. I think the great mass of people can be reached in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. So even under the most favorable conditions you feel that this intellectual appeal would be successful?

Mr. STARNES. In time.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I think it would be sufficient to keep the movement growing.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think the fact that there were only 84,000 of them who voted in the United States 3 years ago is any indication?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I think those who were not smart enough to vote for me were smart enough to vote for Roosevelt.

Mr. STARNES. Twenty-seven million of us voted for him 3 years ago. I do not know whether they were all Democrats or not, but 27,000,000 voted for him, and there were 17,000,000 in opposition, or a total of 44,000,000 American citizens exercising the right of the ballot, which is notice that they were voting for the preservation and continuing of the form of government we have now rather than for a form of government under which 170,000,000 souls are ruled through the operations of 3,500,000 people.

Mr. BROWDER. May I comment on that?

The CHAIRMAN. No; I think not.

Mr. BROWDER. Merely to register the fact that there are 70,000,000 votes cast in the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. With one candidate, or one line of candidates, Hitler practically got every vote in Germany, according to his figures.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, returning to the Lenin School, which we started to discuss, have you ever attended the Lenin School?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I have not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have most of your district organizers and other main officials attended that school?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. What percentage of them, would you say?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say not more than four or five.

Mr. WHITLEY. Four or five of your principal officials and organizers?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many members of the C. P. U. S. A. altogether have attended the Lenin School in Moscow?

Mr. BROWDER. I have no statistics on that.

Mr. WHITLEY. Approximately?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say approximately 120, and possibly as much as 150.

Mr. WHITLEY. None since 1933?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did Mr. Benjamin Gold, the president of the Fur Workers' International Union, attend the Lenin School?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know whether he did or not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did Mr. Potash, the secretary of the same union, attend?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did Mr. Clarence Hathaway, the editor of the Daily Worker, attend the Lenin School?

Mr. BROWDER. Hathaway did, I believe.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did Mr. Marcel Scherer, of the Union of Chemists and Technicians, attend the Lenin School?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would it be an underestimate or an overestimate to say that the Lenin School has trained approximately 400 members of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that is a gross exaggeration.

Mr. WHITLEY. What subjects are taught in the Lenin School, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Political economy, philosophy, and history; those are the main subjects.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do they teach studies and methods of party domination?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do they teach military training to the students?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. No military training?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are they instructed in methods of street fighting and civil war?

Mr. BROWDER. They were not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are they taught the theory of combat organization and tactics, and politics, to produce civil strife?

Mr. BROWDER. They were not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are they taught rifle and machine-gun and war practice in the "red" army armories?

Mr. BROWDER. They were not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does not the same school turn out organizers for other countries?

Mr. BROWDER. It did.

Mr. WHITLEY. It did turn them out?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not think the school exists now for several years.

Mr. WHITLEY. The school is not in existence?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. During the period of its existence it was financed and operated by the Soviet Government?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. It was not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who operated the school?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. It was financed and operated by the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What were the reasons for the discontinuance of the school?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that most of the other Communist Parties had the same experience that we had. We found it produced very unsatisfactory results.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did any of the members of the Communist Party of the United States who were sent over there for instruction subsequently come back to this country and instruct party members or pass on to them, these party members in this country, the instruction that they had received over there?

Mr. BROWDER. I suppose everyone who gets an education everywhere passes it on wherever he may be working.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is not responsive. I ask the question again.

The CHAIRMAN. You can make that responsive.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is either "yes" or "no." Do you know of any instances where members who went over there, received instruction, and came back, and in turn, instructed party members in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. If I must answer "yes" or "no," I would have to say "yes." That does not explain anything, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to make some pertinent explanation in connection with that?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. BROWDER. I would explain that, of course, the whole purpose of education is to get it in order to spread it to others.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that answer the question?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, name the official publications of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. BROWDER. The Daily Worker is the official organ of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is a daily newspaper?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Printed in New York City?

Mr. BROWDER. In New York City.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any others?

Mr. BROWDER. The party also publishes a theoretical magazine known as The Communist, a monthly.

The party publishes a monthly magazine on legislative questions called National Issues. I believe those are all the official publications. There are numerous publications that are more or less based upon the Communist teachings that are not officially a part of the party machinery.

Mr. STARNES. The New South; how do you classify that publication?

Mr. BROWDER. The New South is a nonparty publication. The Communist Party supports it.

Mr. STARNES. Who is the editor?

Mr. BROWDER. Really, I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is the Communist Party directly or indirectly connected with any other publications than those you have mentioned as being official publications?

Mr. BROWDER. Indirectly; innumerable publications.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you name those and indicate the degree of the connection?

Mr. BROWDER. There are some 9 or 10 daily newspapers in various languages which are supported by the Communists, and which in general take the Communist point of view.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you name those?

Mr. BROWDER. There is the Freiheit, a Jewish daily in New York City; the Ukrainian Daily News, a daily in New York City; there

is the Laisve, a Lithuanian daily in New York; there is the Wilnos, another Lithuanian daily in Chicago; there is the Eetampain, a Finnish daily in New York; there is the Tyomies, a Finnish daily, Superior, Wis.

Mr. WHITLEY. Approximately how many other language newspapers do you have, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say about three or four more dailies, and perhaps a dozen weeklies.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the connection or the extent of the support given those papers by the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. The support that is given is that their readers are mostly Communists. That is, their supporting body of readers are mostly Communists, and the editorial line of these papers—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You have many sympathizers who are not members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any official membership for sympathizers?

Mr. BROWDER. No; we do not.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not have any sympathizers' group or anything like that?

Mr. BROWDER. No. We have made no attempt to set up any formal organization among our sympathizers.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any way of approximating how many sympathizers you have for each party member?

Mr. BROWDER. Well. I would say it is at least in the ratio of about 5 to 1.

The CHAIRMAN. For every party member you have five sympathizers?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Have you any publications on the West coast. If so, name them for us, please.

Mr. BROWDER. We have organizations which were initiated by Communists, although they are not official Communist organizations and several non-Communist newspapers, daily newspapers, in the English language, in Chicago, and in San Francisco.

Mr. STARNES. Will you name them?

Mr. BROWDER. In Chicago, the Daily Record was initiated by Communists, and while it is a nonparty paper, and tries to serve as broad a public as possible, everybody knows that it was the Communists' support that made it possible.

Mr. STARNES. And in Frisco?

Mr. BROWDER. In San Francisco, there is a similar paper known as the People's World.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, does the party cooperate or assist these various papers you have mentioned other than just to endorse them officially?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do they lend them financial support?

Mr. BROWDER. We help organize their financial campaigns.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you contribute to the papers in any way?

Mr. BROWDER. We sometimes raise loans for them when they are in financial difficulty, but they have finally to cover their budget by their mass campaigns for contributions.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you do officially endorse them and assist them in every way possible because they generally follow the Communist Party line or program?

Mr. BROWDER. That is, they follow the line of the cooperation of Communists with all the other elements.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do they publish articles written by Communists?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about the actual management of those papers? Are the management Communist members or at least, sympathizers?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say all of them are at least sympathizers.

Mr. WHITLEY. And a great many of them members?

Mr. BROWDER. Quite a few of them members.

Mr. WHITLEY. But they are not described by you as official publications?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Because they are not entirely controlled and operated by the party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right. And they make their appeal to a broader field than if they were official publications.

The CHAIRMAN. Just in that connection, when you speak of the party line, you mean the party line of the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean the party line of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. When we say line, we mean a consistent policy, a policy that is followed up.

The CHAIRMAN. In the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That has no reference to any other Communist party?

Mr. BROWDER. Unless we are talking about the other Communist party.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any single instance where the Communist Party of the United States has ever disagreed with the Communist line in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Never have.

The CHAIRMAN. You have always been together?

Mr. BROWDER. We sure have.

The CHAIRMAN. That has not been by any prearrangement or anything of that sort.

Mr. BROWDER. No; but not by accident, either.

The CHAIRMAN. It is because—

Mr. BROWDER. It is because we think from the same premise.

The CHAIRMAN. You have the materialistic interpretation of history, is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. We think from the same premises.

The CHAIRMAN. Which is the materialistic philosophy, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. We think the material conditions of life determine our thoughts, rather than the thoughts determining the material conditions of life.

The CHAIRMAN. So that has been responsible for the fact that in all the years in which your party has been in existence you have been in complete unanimity and harmony with Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. We have a common philosophy.

The CHAIRMAN. You were with Russia in all of its fight against nazi-ism?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You consider Russia today the greatest single foe of nazi-ism, do you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You think it is doing more to stop nazi-ism than any other government on earth?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. BROWDER. I will be glad to go deeper into that question.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked you a question and you answered it; go ahead.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who owns the official publication of the Communist Party? I mean, what is the organizational set-up that controls and operates the publication?

Mr. BROWDER. The only one that I am in any way familiar with is the Daily Worker and the others I am not familiar with at all, so far as their formal organization is concerned.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the operating organization for the Daily Worker?

Mr. BROWDER. It is a corporation.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the name of the corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. The Daily Publishing Co. Formerly it was the Comprodaily Publishing Co. But that corporation went into bankruptcy proceedings because of a foreclosure of some debts and it is now a new corporation.

Mr. WHITLEY. When did the bankruptcy occur?

Mr. BROWDER. Some months ago.

Mr. WHITLEY. Within the last year?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. That is, there was a pressing of immediate settlement of debts, and the creditor insisted upon getting an immediate settlement even though it was pressing a bankruptcy which caused certain losses.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who were the stockholders of the Compro Publishing Co., which was a corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. Really, I could not answer that offhand.

Mr. WHITLEY. Could you determine that for me; in other words, who owned the corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. That could be found out.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who were the stockholders and officers of the corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you have that information for us tomorrow?

Mr. BROWDER. I will try and get it for you.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Compro Publishing Co., a corporation incorporated in the State of New York?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Operating or publishing the Daily Worker?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. As a separate corporate entity?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you will have the officers and stockholders and directors of that corporation for us?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I think that can be gotten.

Mr. STARNES. They are all Communists, I presume.

Mr. BROWDER. I am not sure. I do not think they were. I think there were some non-Communists among them.

Mr. WHITLEY. That corporation went into bankruptcy in the past year?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Owners of the Comprodaily Publishing Co., 50 East Thirteenth Street, New York City: Jack Lowrey, Carl Brodsky, William Browder.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the name of the new corporation which has taken over the business of the Daily Worker?

Mr. BROWDER. Let me see if I have a copy of the paper with me and I will check on it.

I am afraid I have not a copy here, but I will get you the official name from the paper.

Mr. WHITLEY. The official name of the new corporation.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What were the assets and the liabilities of the Compro Publishing Co. when it went into bankruptcy, do you recall?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know, but I know that always our liabilities are greater than our assets.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that publication self-supporting?

Mr. BROWDER. No; it is not.

Mr. WHITLEY. To what extent does the Communist Party subsidize the Daily Worker?

Mr. BROWDER. The subsidy is in the form not directly of help from the party, but by an annual fund-raising campaign, a direct appeal to the public for contributions to the paper. There is one such just started now. It is the regular time of the year for us to have such and we are raising \$100,000 by this appeal to the readers of the paper. That is approximately the amount of the deficit of the paper each year.

Mr. WHITLEY. One hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is made up through a campaign?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which is conducted by the party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; by the paper and the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the reason for the bankruptcy? Was there any reason other than just the fact that it was insolvent?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; some of the creditors—no; we are always insolvent. Creditors who give us credit always know that they do it on the basis of crediting an insolvent corporation. That is, its liabilities are always greater than its assets.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who were the petitioning creditors in this instance?

Mr. BROWDER. But from their experience they have learned that once a year we make up that deficit by our campaign.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did the Compro Publishing Co. go into bankruptcy prior or subsequent to the granting of a judgment against it to Mrs. Walter Liggett?

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Brodsky, my lawyer, tells me that it was not a bankruptcy at all, but a judgment of a creditor which was forced to a sale.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was the judgment which was obtained by Mrs. Walter Liggett?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. It was not.

Mr. BRODSKY. It was some other creditor.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know the name of the creditor?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I do not know who it was. The whole thing was rather sudden.

Mr. WHITLEY. That judgment made it necessary to put the Compro Publishing Co. into bankruptcy?

Mr. BROWDER. When the Daily Worker was sold, we had to form another corporation.

Mr. WHITLEY. To carry on the publication?

Mr. BROWDER. To carry on the publication.

Mr. WHITLEY. In that manner, of course, this judgment was defeated; this judgment which was obtained against the corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. No judgment of that kind could ever be collected because, as I say, the Daily Worker—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). What was the amount of the judgment, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Of which judgment?

Mr. WHITLEY. The judgment which was obtained against the Compro Publishing Co. prior to its bankruptcy?

Mr. BROWDER. That forced the sale?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know the amount of it. As I said, the Daily Worker never has assets in any way commensurate to its liabilities.

Mr. WHITLEY. But that deficit is made up by the campaign conducted by the party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the corporation, if it is a corporation, which publishes The Communist, its monthly magazine?

Mr. BROWDER. That is published by the Workers Library Publishers.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the relation between the Workers' Library Publishers and the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. It is a corporation which specializes in the market of the Communist Party membership.

Mr. WHITLEY. It specializes in publishing and distributing Communist Party literature?

Mr. BROWDER. Those things—not always party literature—but those things which would sell in Communist Party circles.

Mr. WHITLEY. And they are sold through Communist Party channels?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that a corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. That is a corporation.

Mr. WHITLEY. A New York State corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And who are the directors, the incorporators, and the officers of that corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know. Do you know, Mr. Brodsky?

Mr. BRODSKY. I would not know offhand. I can get them for you.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is operated in the same manner as the corporation which publishes the Daily Worker, a separate corporation

which puts out *The Communist*, the monthly magazine, which also puts out other party literature.

Mr. BROWDER. In a similar manner, except that it has no public fund-raising campaign.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is it in any way or to any extent subsidized or financed by the party?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is self-supporting?

Mr. BROWDER. It is self-supporting.

Mr. WHITLEY. Through its sale of literature through party channels?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about *National Issues*, the other publication—a monthly publication, I believe you said?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. How is that periodical handled?

Mr. BROWDER. The business end of it is handled in the Workers' Library Publishers, and it breaks even, about, between its income and expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. By the way, do you have one of your blank membership cards with you, membership cards in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I have not with me, but I could get one sent down.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you get one? I will appreciate it.

Mr. BROWDER. Surely.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, what is approximately the total circulation of the official Communist Party publications; that is, the daily paper and the two monthly periodicals?

Mr. BROWDER. The Daily Worker, I believe, has approximately 50,000 copies a day. The Communist, monthly magazine, about 15,000 copies per month. National Issues, the legislative magazine, about eight or nine thousand copies per month.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any idea concerning the total circulation of the publications which you have described as being approved by the party which you do not consider official party organs; the various language papers and the Midwest Worker, and the People's World?

Mr. BROWDER. I can only give the roughest estimate. I would say perhaps 250,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. Daily circulation of those various papers which you mentioned?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, what are the sources of material for your official publications? Is it all prepared by the staff of the publications?

Mr. BROWDER. Not entirely; no. We draw from most varied sources.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you publish or republish material from foreign sources?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What foreign sources in particular?

Mr. BROWDER. We have the United Press service, in the first place. Then we get the News Agency, France Mont.

Mr. WHITLEY. What agency is that?

Mr. BROWDER. They have an agency in Paris. It operates with us.

Mr. WHITLEY. A privately owned agency?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; which operates with us and our newspapers here through the Inter-Continent News here, which exchanges news with them and sends on news to other countries from here. We get information directly from Communist parties of other countries, besides the press associations, and articles we get from all sources.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have the service of the Soviet News Agency, the Tass?

Mr. BROWDER. No; we do not get that. That is already tied up with some sort of a contract with the Associated Press.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the connection between the Communist Party of the United States and the International Publishers?

Mr. BROWDER. There is no connection except that the International Publishers publish books that we use.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is an entirely separate corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. It is a private corporation.

Mr. WHITLEY. A private corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has nothing to do with the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are any of the officials of the International Publishers connected with the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe they are.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you name those for us?

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Trachtenberg.

Mr. WHITLEY. Alexander Trachtenberg?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is his position with the International Publishers?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know technically the position he holds in the company, but he is the active manager.

Mr. BRODSKY. Secretary-treasurer.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Brodsky tells me he is the secretary-treasurer.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is his official position in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. He is a member of our national committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does he head any other committees?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have a literature committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, it is possible he may be the head of some committee like a literature committee. I am not sure about that.

Mr. WHITLEY. Could you find out for us?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Other than the fact that he is general manager or the active manager of International Publishers, or that the active manager of International Publishers is an official of the Communist Party, there is no connection?

Mr. BROWDER. And a very active member of our party, too. But the business is not party business.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is entirely separate?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is a private corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. It is a private corporation.

Mr. WHITLEY. And there are no financial relations of any kind?

Mr. BROWDER. No. The party has never made any investments in it.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the relation of the Communist Party of the United States with the Wholesale Book Co.?

Mr. BROWDER. That I do not know. That is a detail I have never come across.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether there is any or not? Would you say there is no connection?

Mr. BROWDER. It is just a new name to me. I have not run across it in my daily work. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Could you find out and let us know?

Mr. BROWDER. I can find out.

Mr. WHITLEY. If there is any connection and what that connection is?

Mr. BROWDER. That is the Wholesale—

Mr. WHITLEY. The Wholesale Book Co.

Mr. CASEY. Where is it published?

Mr. WHITLEY. New York City. Mr. Browder, how many book shops or book stores does the Communist Party operate?

Mr. BROWDER. Directly, none. The book stores are organized on a business basis, like the publishing activity. Each book store separately stands on its own feet. But they are book stores that have the support of the party and which have associated themselves into a sort of trade association for certain cooperative efforts. A list of such stores as that is contained on the back of some of our pamphlets that I think I can refer to. That is the best answer to your question.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those book stores are private enterprises which have the endorsement of the party, is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. They are corporations. In some instances, they may have had party support, even to the extent of putting money in them. I would not say they are the private property of individuals.

Mr. WHITLEY. They are the channels through which the party sells its literature, is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, they handle party literature?

Mr. BROWDER. It is one of the channels.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any way by which you can estimate approximately how many pieces of Communist literature the party sends out every year through the United States, through all channels?

Mr. BROWDER. In the way of books and pamphlets?

The CHAIRMAN. Everything.

Mr. BROWDER. That is rather difficult to estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say as many as 5,000,000 pieces of literature are sent out over the country, through the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that would be rather conservative. I would say more than 5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Probably 10,000,000?

Mr. BROWDER. Maybe not 10.

The CHAIRMAN. Between 5 and 10 million pieces?

Mr. BROWDER. Certainly more than 5; the books and pamphlets alone, you see, we ran 1,500,000 last year.

The CHAIRMAN. Books and pamphlets alone?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And that represents—

Mr. BROWDER. My own pamphlet here [indicating] sold, for example, 170,000, something like that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Democratic Front, where you get together with everybody that has the same views you do?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right. That sold some 170,000, about 10 percent of the book circulation.

The CHAIRMAN. Referring to the figure you gave, one and a half million, that reached a great many people who are not members of the Communist Party, of course.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And the total estimate of between 5 and 10 million, those reached a great many people in the United States who are not members of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. A great many. I would say between 5 and 10 for everyone who is a member.

The CHAIRMAN. If it were 10, it would be, say, a million people?

Mr. BROWDER. Somewhere between half a million and a million people.

The CHAIRMAN. Somewhere between half a million and a million people are receiving the publications of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right, and pay for them.

Mr. MASON. In connection with the Democratic Front, I would like to ask—

The CHAIRMAN. That is the book that he has there, that he has published.

Mr. MASON. Yes; I want to ask this question: What so-called progressive measures that have been instituted in this country during, say, the last 10 years would you say have been initiated and sponsored by the Communist Party of America, and therefore they are entitled to the credit for initiating and sponsoring them?

Mr. BROWDER. None in the form in which they were enacted. I would say, however, on the question of unemployment insurance the Communist Party made the first great campaign that placed this question before the country, and in this campaign established certain principles which were partially adopted in the Social Security Law. But the Social Security Law as it became a concrete legislative project and was adopted, was in no way a direct result of the Communist Party's work.

Mr. MASON. Of course, Mr. Browder, you understand that whenever any principle is incorporated into law, it has to go through the legislative hopper and, of course, is changed decidedly.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MASON. And so no one could claim that they initiated and sponsored a particular law.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MASON. But it is the idea, or the ideal, that has been incorporated into the law that I have in mind. And that is one of them that you would claim your party initiated in principle, although not the actual law that was passed.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. Although in the interest of modesty I would have to say that I know, of course, that the great majority of the

people who became convinced that such measures were necessary were never conscious of the fact that the Communist Party led in propagating this idea. We reached not more than 10 percent of the people who were convinced of the necessity of this measure.

Mr. MASON. Of course, Mr. Browder, in that same connection, I have lived long enough to see what used to be considered purely socialistic principles adopted into law by all parties during the years.

Mr. BROWDER. I am sure the same thing will happen with us, too.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to ask this question: What other pieces of legislation did your party support?

Mr. BROWDER. Our party has supported practically every measure that has been known as a part of the New Deal since 1935. We did not support the first phase of the New Deal, that phase which was based primarily upon the devaluation of the dollar and the N. R. A. We had very mixed feelings about that period of the New Deal.

Mr. THOMAS. Generally since 1935, you have supported every piece of legislation that was—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). That has been known as characteristic of the New Deal type of legislation.

Mr. MASON. Will you be willing to state, Mr. Browder, why you have supported these New Deal measures, as you called them since 1935? Was it because you thought it would advance the cause of Communism in the United States more rapidly by doing that, or is that the evolutionary way of bringing about communism?

Mr. BROWDER. No; we do not think that it is the evolutionary way of bringing about communism; we do not consider socialism or communism is the New Deal and if we support that it is not because we have any expectations that out of such measures socialism and communism will come but because we are interested in orderly progress and we do not see any other possible road in which it can be brought about, by which there can be orderly progress in America. We believe that no one can expect to bring socialism to the American people unless at the same time he is very practically supporting the measure of orderly progress.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What special legislation do you recall that your party was in favor of passing in 1935 that has been passed since 1935?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say especially the Labor Relations Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The N. L. R. B.?

Mr. BROWDER. N. R. L. B. The wage-hours.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The wages and hours?

Mr. BROWDER. The wages-and-hours law.

Mr. DEMPSEY. As I recall, the Labor Relations Act was supported by other parties?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And really did not become a party issue.

Mr. BROWDER. Many of the things we supported have not only been supported by the Congress but the country.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The wages and hours bill was in that category, except in certain parts of the South.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Among the Democratic Members of the House.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What other pieces of legislation?

Mr. BROWDER. The W. P. A.: Social Security.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The W. P. A. and the Social Security was supported by Republicans and Democrats alike in the House.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. And we supported the more controversial measures in which there was a divided opinion. The reorganization; we supported the Supreme Court reform bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The what?

Mr. BROWDER. The Supreme Court reform bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is that what you call it?

Mr. BROWDER. Well—

Mr. THOMAS. Commonly called the Supreme Court packing bill?

Mr. BROWDER. Is that the congressional name for it?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Trotskyized name for it.

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I submit to the courtesy of the Congress.

Mr. CASEY. Do you believe that within the framework of the democratic principle of government there can be worked out a happy and an economic prosperous citizenry?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that only within the democratic principles can such a plan be worked out.

Mr. CASEY. Do you believe and does the Communist Party of America believe in the traditions of Lincoln and Jefferson?

Mr. BROWDER. Emphatically; yes.

Mr. CASEY. Do you differ from those traditions today in any respect?

Mr. BROWDER. I think they have to be developed to fit modern conditions. We say the principles are sound and furnish a basis for all future progress, but you understand that conditions have changed and we have to work out the principles in new form.

For example, I think that Jefferson's concrete development of the democratic principle fitted the conditions existing at that time, at a time when the economic conditions were largely in the hands of the individual producers, and by his ownership and own means he produced, which gave a solid foundation for those democratic principles, but today private ownership and means of production differ.

Mr. CASEY. Do you believe if Jefferson and Lincoln were alive today they would abolish private ownership and production?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, many of the practices, I am sure they would.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, gentlemen, that is getting a little far afield; it is too speculative.

Mr. BROWDER. Everyone is entitled to his opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions, Mr. Casey?

Mr. CASEY. That is all.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, did you determine how many book shops there were?

Mr. BROWDER. I have a list here that was printed on the pamphlet The Democratic Front, and I assume that it is approximately accurate.

Mr. WHITLEY. That shows the number and locations of book shops?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which you say are not entirely operated by the party, or at least entirely by the party as an outlet for party literature.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. But they handle the party's literature almost exclusively?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not say almost exclusively. Most of them handle various kinds of literature.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the sources, some of the sources, from which they secure that literature?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know whether it is all from the Worker's Library Publishers or not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you furnish the reporter with a list of those book shops?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

(The list of Associated National Book Shops, shown on the back page of the publication The Democratic Front follows:)

Baltimore, Md., International Bookshop, 501-A North Eutaw Street; Birmingham, Ala., Jane Speed's Bookshop, 1907 Fifth Avenue North; Boston, Mass., Progressive Bookshop, 8 Beach Street; Chicago, Ill., Twentieth Century Bookshop, 200 West Van Buren Street; Cleveland, Ohio, Modern Bookshop, 1522 Prospect Avenue; Detroit, Mich., Modern Bookshop, 2610 Clifford Street; Los Angeles, Calif., Progressive Bookshop, 226½ South Spring Street; Milwaukee, Wis., Workers Literature Agency, 914 North Plankinton Avenue, room 1; Newark, N. J., People's Bookshop, 216 Hale St.; Minneapolis, Minn., Progressive Bookshop, 631 Third Avenue South; New Haven, Conn., Nathan Hale Bookshop, 38 High Street; New Orleans, La., People's Bookshop, 130 Chartres Street; New York, N. Y., Workers Bookshop, 50 East Thirteenth Street; Oklahoma City, Okla., Progressive Bookshop, 129½ West Grand Avenue; Philadelphia, Pa., New World Bookshop, 508 Court Place; Richmond, Va., Peoples Bookshop, 301 North First Street; Salt Lake City, Utah, People's Bookshop, 74 West First Street; St. Paul, Minn., Progressive Bookshop, 26 East Fourth Street; San Francisco, Calif., International Bookshop, 170 Golden Gate Avenue; Seattle, Wash., Frontier Bookstore, 701 Pine Street.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, what is the Amtorg Trading Corporation?

Mr. BROWDER. All I know, by reputation, it is a trading organization of the Soviet Government.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where is it located?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. It has an office in New York City?

Mr. BROWDER. In New York City.

Mr. WHITLEY. And all you know about it is that it is an alleged trading group of the Soviet Government?

Mr. BROWDER. I know its public reputation is that.

Mr. WHITLEY. As a business concern?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the relationship of the Amtorg Trading Corporation and the Communist Party of the United States, if any?

Mr. BROWDER. There is none.

Mr. WHITLEY. None whatever?

Mr. BROWDER. None whatever.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is, not to any extent is there any connection with the party's program?

Mr. BROWDER. Not to any extent is there any relationship of its business with the Communist Party.

Mr. CASEY. Has the Amtorg ever contacted any members of the Communist Party of America in order to purchase supplies?

Mr. BROWDER. I never heard of such a thing.

Mr. CASEY. You have not?

Mr. BROWDER. The members of the Communist Party are not usually in the business of selling supplies.

Mr. CASEY. No; but you have heard, undoubtedly, of the Amtorg's activities in America for the purpose of purchasing supplies for Russia. Have you ever heard of that?

Mr. BROWDER. Purchase of supplies from Russia?

Mr. CASEY. For Russia.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; they do business with a general group of Americans.

Mr. CASEY. The Communist Party does not enter into those particular trading activities at all?

Mr. BROWDER. Not at all.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, what is the relationship between the Communist Party of the United States and the Young Communist League?

Mr. BROWDER. The relationship of a friendly or fraternal organization. There is no organizational tie between them at all. The Young Communist League is independent, but friendly and cooperates with the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the administrative organization of the Young Communist League?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not fully familiar with it. I know that the president of the organization is Gil Green, who is also a member of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is also a member?

Mr. BROWDER. He is an active leader of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. And is a member of your national party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. And he is president of the Young Communist League.

Mr. WHITLEY. He also is a member?

Mr. STARNES. What was the name?

Mr. WHITLEY. Gilbert Green.

He is also a member of the executive committee of the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. One of the four American members of that body?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. He is now in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is president of the Young Communist League in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, is the policy of the organization of the Y. C. L. in the hands of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is not?

Mr. BROWDER. It is in the hands of the young people.

Mr. WHITLEY. Entirely?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MASON. Would you bring out the idea that there is, you might say, an interlocking directorate between the two organizations in that there is an overlapping?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is, the president of the Y. C. L. is a member of the party.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; there is a very close personal contact between them.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Young Communist, rather, the Young Communist League, is under the direction of the district organizer and works under the direction of the organizer of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No. The party, of course, demands some recognition of course, from those to whom it gives help, but they have their own organizers.

Mr. WHITLEY. But the officers of the Y. C. L., the Young Communist League, are under the control; its activities are that of a front organization?

Mr. BROWDER. I have never heard of it being in control; I have heard of it carrying on activities over a very broad field. It encourages its membership to be active in all organizations of young people wherever it has members.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. And they will be active in those organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Right in that connection, as a matter of fact, it is the policy of the Communists to be active in all these organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. The Young Communists—

The CHAIRMAN. Not only among the Young Communists, but all Communists.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; young and middle-aged, black and white.

The CHAIRMAN. You also utilize the qualifications of the members.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, some members have a particular qualification and will go into labor unions.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And some having particular qualifications go into teaching.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one of the purposes, to utilize the members in every organization.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; it has been our effort to spread enlightenment.

The CHAIRMAN. Through all organizations.

Mr. BROWDER. To take the message to people everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. That is done principally through these activities.

Mr. STARNES. You call it "enlightenment."

The CHAIRMAN. Not propaganda?

Mr. BROWDER. We have called it propaganda, too, but that word has somewhat fallen into disrepute from its original sense when it referred to the propagation of religion.

Mr. STARNES. I noticed that the other day some of the witnesses also used the word "enlightenment."

Mr. BROWDER. We use education, propaganda, enlightenment; everything that has an educational purpose, mass educational purpose, educating the mass of people.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, the Young Communist League works generally among the schools and universities by way of enlightening the student body?

Mr. BROWDER. As far as it has membership; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And is it also active in the National Students' Union?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, if it has members in the National Students' Union.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about the American Youth Congress; is it active in that congress?

Mr. BROWDER. The Young Communist League has a chapter in the American Youth Congress.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Young Communist League is affiliated with the Young Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe it is; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You believe it is?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you not know whether it is or not?

Mr. BROWDER. I can't give you the details of the relationship.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. But I know the policy.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that international body for the Young Communist League functions like the Communist International; the international organization is for the various divisions of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is approximately correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where is the headquarters for the Young Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe they are in Paris.

Mr. WHITLEY. In Paris?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I know the secretary of the Young Communist International has headquarters at Paris.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you describe the relationships between the Young Communist League and the Young Communist International, the extent of the relationship?

Mr. BROWDER. Roughly the same as between the Young Communist League and the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see; just a friendly cooperative relationship, but with no actual authority?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. With no active direction over it?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; that is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. When are the congresses of the Young Communist League held?

Mr. BROWDER. There is no fixed time for them; they are held at the call of the executive committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many congresses have there been?

Mr. BROWDER. Six.

Mr. WHITLEY. Six; there have been six congresses of the Young Communist League, and there have been seven of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where are those congresses held?

Mr. BROWDER. Moscow.

Mr. WHITLEY. They have all been held there?

Mr. BROWDER. Have all been held in Moscow.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many camps has the Communist Party of the United States, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Camps?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. That is summer camps, I suppose you mean?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. They are mostly cooperative organizations, I believe, and if by that you mean how many of these camps are participated in by Communists, where they play a predominant role in the policies, I do not believe that I could answer. But offhand I would say I personally know of five or six.

Mr. WHITLEY. Five or six?

Mr. BROWDER. And there may be many others that I have not heard of.

Mr. WHITLEY. And to what extent does the Communist Party participate in the organization and operation of those camps?

Mr. BROWDER. As a party it doesn't participate.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not as a party?

Mr. BROWDER. Not as a party.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what manner does it participate?

Mr. BROWDER. The party sponsors the work of these camps by organizing them; the material organization of the camp, the legal organization is in the main cooperative.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who cooperates in the venture?

Mr. BROWDER. Everybody that can be interested in it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any other individuals than members?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I mean, who gets into them, and organizes the camps?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, even nonmembers.

Mr. WHITLEY. Nonmembers?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where are the camps located?

Mr. BROWDER. There is, as far as I know in these camps, no question ever raised of party membership as a condition for participating.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the party own the property where the camps are located?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether it leases the property for the purpose of the camps?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I think the property is all owned privately; maybe owned by cooperative organizations.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. A corporation set up to hold the property.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you do not know about that?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not give attention to that.

Mr. WHITLEY. You know the party as such does not actually operate the camps?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. It does not.

Mr. BROWDER. The party as such does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. And to what extent does the Young Communist League participate in the organization and operation of the camps?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say much the same as the party; membership in the party is not required.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you stress a youth camp and an old persons camp, or are they operated together?

Mr. BROWDER. The only camps I know of are general camps.

Mr. WHITLEY. For all classes?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. There are no restrictions?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. No restrictions that certain age limits are required?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. There are general vacation camps.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. And where are these camps located, of the ones you know about. You suggested six or seven, I believe.

Mr. BROWDER. I know of a camp, Unity, at Wingdale, N. Y.; Camp Beacon, at Beacon, N. Y.

There is a camp in Wisconsin which is frequented by party members. I do not know to what degree the party members control or own it, but I know that they have organized vacation activities there.

There is another one at Boston.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. Any others?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe there is one in Philadelphia, and so on.

Mr. WHITLEY. These camps, Mr. Browder—

Mr. THOMAS. Find out how many there are and where they are located.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know of any others?

Mr. BROWDER. None that I know offhand.

Mr. WHITLEY. There are others the location of which you do not know?

Mr. BROWDER. I only make that qualification because I don't know but what there might be such camps.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do the district organizations of the Communist Party participate actively in the camps?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I would say that every subdivision of the party that would have contact with people where there are such camps would concern itself with the policies and education of the camp.

Mr. WHITLEY. What has been the training and instructions which have been given in these camps, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Largely of a cultural nature.

Mr. WHITLEY. You stated, I believe, the party does actively participate in training and instructions in the camps?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I do not know of any specific, extensive school conducted in these vacation camps, in which a program is carried on; it is largely of a cultural nature.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are any foreign ideologies taught in these camps?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. What flags or emblems of foreign countries would be displayed in the camps?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that in most of the camps that I have been in they had, together with the American flag, the Soviet flag.

Mr. WHITLEY. And does the Communist Party, Mr. Browder, make any particular effort to enlist or recruit members in the armed forces of the United States, the Army and the Navy?

Mr. BROWDER. No; we do not. We used to years ago, but in the past 6 or 7 years we have not only discouraged it but have definitely prohibited any special recruiting in the armed forces.

Mr. WHITLEY. What has been the reason for that change, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Because we have had a change in attitude toward the Government of the United States, toward its administrative doctrines and change in relationship to the question—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). But you did formerly attempt to recruit members?

Mr. BROWDER. We used to try to make specific effort to find sympathetic contact and to do educational work in the armed forces.

Mr. WHITLEY. Why was that done; why did you have a particular interest in recruiting members in the armed forces?

Mr. BROWDER. Because we wanted to make sure that the armed forces were not turned into an instrument against the people.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. STARNES. What do you mean by that statement?

Mr. BROWDER. I mean that it is very important that it should not happen here what happened in Spain where the army destroyed the republic, and we saw the general course of America was in quite the opposite direction and we abandoned this attempt in the armed forces.

Mr. CASEY. You do not think there is any reason to fear such a thing happening in America?

Mr. BROWDER. No; we do not think there is any danger of the Army destroying the American republic, although there may be a lot of people in the Army who have crazy ideas.

Mr. STARNES. We have a lot of crazy people in this country, do we not?

Mr. BROWDER. Quite a few; some think I am crazy

Mr. STARNES. You referred to culture. What type of culture do you teach?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, we Communists pride ourselves on the influence we have had in the cultural life of America. It has been one of the influences of communism, the Communist influence, that stimulated the arts; rather, there has been a renaissance of American drama and American literature.

Mr. STARNES. How has that been evidenced?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, perhaps no one who is not a Communist would agree with that. I am, of course, giving you our own idea of it. We think that great vitality in American drama has taken place. For example, that was so well developed in the theater work under the W. P. A.; the old W. P. A. set-up had it originally—we had it before the theater set-up was developed in the W. P. A.

Mr. STARNES. You mean in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. No; located in the United States. I am talking about the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. You are talking about the Federal Theater project?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that your party originated it?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I said it stimulated the cultural movement. That the theater movement was developed to a greater extent, as a result of that stimulus.

Mr. MASON. That was the "little theater." This movement was long before that?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MASON. The so-called little theater movement.

Mr. BROWDER. Well, it was not the little theater movement, that was after this.

Mr. STARNES. You said no foreign ideology was taught in these camps.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. But you do teach communism?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, on the "little theater"; your party was not responsible for that?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean movements like that.

Mr. BROWDER. I spoke of the drama.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. And, as I say, the Communist Party had a great deal to do with that, and I do not want to take any credit away from anyone else.

The CHAIRMAN. Your members have had no trouble cooperating with any other groups?

Mr. BROWDER. Not the slightest.

The CHAIRMAN. And a great deal of your work with the Communists is with the objective of having well-trained members; is that true?

Mr. BROWDER. In most places our people, the members of our party, find no difficulty working with other people.

The CHAIRMAN. And your people are glad to work with them.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You train, in schools, you train many of your members to be good speakers, do you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I don't know how many good ones we have.

The CHAIRMAN. You try to?

Mr. BROWDER. We try to make better speakers out of them.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right; and you have taken quite a part in the labor unions, have you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Our people have been active in the labor movement.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Now, what type of people largely do you try to train, mostly; poor people, medium class people, or rich people?

Mr. BROWDER. Mostly poor people; that is, people who have to work for their living.

The CHAIRMAN. Mostly unemployed people?

Mr. BROWDER. No, no; I would say about, of the members, I would say about 70 percent of them are employed.

The CHAIRMAN. And 25 percent are unemployed?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, perhaps 30 percent unemployed.

The CHAIRMAN. What proportion of your membership would you class as the intelligentsia—I do not mean that the others are not intelligent, but I am referring to the type of persons usually classed by you in that group?

Mr. BROWDER. Professional?

The CHAIRMAN. I think the term mostly used is "intelligentsia," is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. It has been used, but I prefer the term professional.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. BROWDER. I would say perhaps 12 to 15 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Twelve to fifteen percent are professional?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And about 75 percent are employed?

Mr. BROWDER. About 70 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. And do they get pretty good wages?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, all sorts; from the lowest pay.

The CHAIRMAN. Some high paid?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. So the appeal of communism is not just on account of economics?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. But among the intelligent, higher paid?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. So communism would exist, evidently, under most prosperous condition.

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes; unquestionably.

The CHAIRMAN. So the appeal to the workers is largely to the intellect and not for economic reasons alone.

Mr. BROWDER. Also that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is only a minor party.

Mr. BROWDER. But unless it carries with it an intellectual appeal it would have no significance.

The CHAIRMAN. But as a matter of fact the real backbone of the movement, the Communist movement, was it not, was intellectual—

Mr. BROWDER. I would say the backbone of it was the workers.

The CHAIRMAN. But it was the intelligentsia that organized them and has kept the party going, was it not?

Mr. BROWDER. It was the Communist, the work with the intellectual—

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). I mean, the present communistic movement; in other words, the organization that makes possible for them to successfully bring about a revolution; they are the real vanguard of the organization.

Mr. BROWDER. Of course, they do have others.

The CHAIRMAN. But it is the vanguard of the proletariat.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The generals in connection with the movement.

Mr. BROWDER. Well, we do not give ourselves any title.

The CHAIRMAN. They are the founders, that is, the vanguard of the revolution.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; but we do not give ourselves such a title—

The CHAIRMAN. And they are the general staff.

Mr. BROWDER (continuing). Such as a general staff.

The CHAIRMAN. They are the workers in the revolution.

Mr. BROWDER. Every party has its leaders—

The CHAIRMAN. But I am just talking about the Communist.

Mr. BROWDER. And I am pointing out where we are alike. You referred to their differences.

The CHAIRMAN. You have what is called the general staff of the proletariat.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The ultimate effort which is to establish the movement; and you do believe there is a distinction—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). As a scientific principle.

The CHAIRMAN. As a scientific principle, but you make the distinction between the scientific principle and the organization.

Mr. BROWDER. Entirely opposite.

The CHAIRMAN. And you would be the vanguard in the movement to bring about the revolution, and take control if such revolution came about, just like what took place under Trotsky in Russia—

Mr. BROWDER. There is a distinction between communism and Trotsky.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not a Trotskyite?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. MASON. I would like for you to develop the activities of the Young Communists League and the league members in the youth movements which they have in this country.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. Mr. Browder, you have stated, I believe, that the Young Communists League members were active in the various youth movements.

Mr. BROWDER. I believe so.

Mr. WHITLEY. Including the American student youth movement of the American Youth Congress.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know the extent and nature of activities in these youth organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I can only give you the limit of their activities by saying it is limited by the number of members of the Y. C. L. It has about 25,000 members and they operate and contact with a great many large organizations, of some 5,000,000 members.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. They are a little bit of a drop in the ocean of the youth of America.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. Now within these limits I would say the Young Communist League is doing very good work.

Mr. STARNES. Would you say "a drop in the ocean" or "the leaven of the loaf"; is that not the better term?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I hope that some day they will be such a leaven but at the present time the most I can say is they are a drop in the ocean; they are not a decisive portion.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Young Communist League is supported by the party?

Mr. BROWDER. The party gives them some help; some help to the Young Communist League.

Mr. WHITLEY. By way of contributions to workers of the league?

Mr. BROWDER. We support the headquarters for them.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. What are the principal sources of income of the Young Communist League?

Mr. BROWDER. Dues.

Mr. WHITLEY. Dues?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Contributions?

Mr. BROWDER. Some contributions.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does it have any other source?

Mr. BROWDER. It has a monthly magazine.

Mr. WHITLEY. A monthly magazine?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is its name?

Mr. BROWDER. The Young Communist Review.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who publishes that magazine?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know what company, publishing company, puts it out?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I don't know; I have never paid any attention to that.

Mr. WHITLEY. But the Communist Party does assist them when they need it?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know approximately what is the amount of the budget of the Young Communist League?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't; but it is relatively small in comparison with the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, at the camps, several of which you have named and located for us—the program there is educational and is carried out at least in keeping with the Communist Party program; is that correct—with Communist Party approval?

Mr. BROWDER. That is our aim. There is no organizational guarantee that is so; it depends upon how much influence we exert.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the extent of the influence of the Young Communist League in the various youth organizations and in schools and universities is subject to the limitations of its membership, insofar as numbers are concerned?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, is it the general practice of your Communist Party members to travel on false passports, or to use false passports while traveling?

Mr. BROWDER. No; it is not a general practice.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is it a practice that has been indulged in by party members?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe it has been done in the past.

Mr. WHITLEY. To what extent has it been done in the past?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I would not know exactly.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that done with the party's knowledge and approval?

Mr. BROWDER. It is an individual question in each case.

Mr. WHITLEY. Well, to repeat the question: In the instances where the party membership, the officials, travel on false passports, is it done with the knowledge and approval of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is not done with the knowledge or approval of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, if the individual members choose to travel on false passports, you do not know anything about it and, therefore, have no chance to disapprove?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you cannot say that has been or still is a general practice?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say definitely it is not a general practice.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you would say, although you understand it has been engaged in to some extent, it was engaged in to a very limited extent?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would say that?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know Charles Krumbein?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. WHITLEY. What positions has he held in the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. He is a member of the national committee, of the political committee, and is one of the leaders of the New York district organization. I believe he is State secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is his present position?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And he is presently a member of the highest governing body of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether Mr. Krumbein has ever traveled on a false passport?

Mr. BROWDER. I know he was charged with that and convicted in the Federal court.

Mr. WHITLEY. I ask you, Mr. Browder, if you can identify this photostatic copy of the passport application, and the identifying photograph on there as being Mr. Krumbein's [handing to witness]?

Mr. BROWDER (after examining). I would not be able to identify that photograph; no. It bears a certain superficial resemblance, but I would not recognize him from that photograph.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about this photograph; would you recognize him from that one [handing to witness]

Mr. BROWDER (after examining). That looks a little more like him.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you still could not say that was his photograph?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not swear to it; no.

Mr. WHITLEY. I show you another photograph—

Mr. THOMAS. I did not get that.

The REPORTER (reading). "I could not swear to it; no."

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know his signature when you see it; have you ever seen it?

Mr. BROWDER. Krumbein's signature?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Many times?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I would not say many times. I have seen it.

Mr. STARNES. Are you sufficiently familiar with it so that you could identify it?

Mr. BROWDER. Krumbein's signature?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. Probably I could.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say that is a photograph of Mr. Krumbein?

Mr. BROWDER. That is quite possible, although he looks different from that.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the date of that passport?

Mr. WHITLEY. This particular application, Mr. Thomas, is dated January 22, 1930. That is one application. There is a second application here bearing his photograph, dated October 17, 1927. That application is filed under the name of Albert E. Stewart. The first application was filed under the name of Albert L. Stewart. The third application was filed under the name of Albert E. Stewart, and is dated—well, it was received in the Passport Division of the State Department January 15, 1924.

And you cannot identify any of those photographs as being Mr. Krumbein?

Mr. BROWDER. No. I would say they have a certain resemblance to him.

Mr. WHITLEY. You know that Mr. Krumbein was indicted and prosecuted in the Federal court for illegal use of passports, do you not?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. WHITLEY. And served a sentence for it?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. WHITLEY. And he is presently a member of the executive committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And also a member of the political committee?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. The highest governing body?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long has he been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Since its foundation.

Mr. WHITLEY. Since its foundation—a charter member?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And if Mr. Krumbein, under the name of "Stewart" was traveling on illegally obtained passports, it was not with the knowledge or approval of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. But that did not disqualify him from holding one of the highest positions in the party?

Mr. BROWDER. It did not.

Mr. CASEY. Have you any doubt, that is a photostatic copy of the photograph of Mr. Krumbein?

Mr. BROWDER. I have no reason to question it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you acquainted with Mr. Alfred Wagenknecht?

Mr. BROWDER. I know him; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is his position in the party?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know that he has any official position in the party. He is, I believe, employed at the present time by the newspaper, Daily Record, of Chicago.

Mr. WHITLEY. By the Daily Record, of Chicago?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long has she been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Since its foundation.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is a charter member?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether Mr. Wagenknecht has ever traveled on a false passport, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. If you knew that Mr. Wagenknecht or any other Communist Party member was engaging in that practice, would you, as head of the party, object?

Mr. BROWDER. I would object; I would advise him strongly against it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you acquainted with Mr. Jack Stachel?

Mr. BROWDER. I am.

Mr. WHITLEY. What position does he hold with the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. He is the executive secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. The executive secretary?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long has he been a member?

Mr. BROWDER. Since 1924.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether Mr. Stachel has ever traveled on false passports?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, right along that same line of questioning: Mr. Browder says if he knew these people did travel on false passports, he would object?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. Would they also be prevented from holding office in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No; this is a question that would have to be handled entirely apart from the question of their membership in the party.

Mr. THOMAS. What do you mean, then, when you say you would object?

Mr. BROWDER. I would use my influence to prevent it.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, after you had found out they had done it, though, then what would you do about it?

Mr. BROWDER. I would use all the influence I had to prevent its repetition.

Mr. THOMAS. Probably to the extent of seeing that they did not hold office in the Communist Party, too?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I could not say that. That would have to be determined by other considerations entirely.

Mr. THOMAS. What other considerations?

Mr. BROWDER. Entirely different sort of considerations.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, suppose you found one of these officers had repeatedly traveled over to the other side on false passports, what would you do about that?

Mr. BROWDER. I would see that the thing was stopped.

Mr. THOMAS. And that is all you would do about it?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. You would allow them to continue to hold office in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. That would have to be determined by other things, as far as those things concerned them.

Mr. THOMAS. What other things do you refer to?

Mr. BROWDER. Political considerations.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, if he is serving the Communist Party, you would condone him; if he is on a mission for the Communist Party and was using a false passport, you would not throw him out?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say whether he has a position in the movement, or not, depends entirely upon his political relationship to the big issues in the country today.

The CHAIRMAN. And if his political relationship were satisfactory to you, then you would not throw him out of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. Membership in the party is determined only by political considerations.

Mr. CASEY. Do not his personal integrity, character, and personal matters have any weight?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; where they become political considerations. We do not try to regulate the personal life of people; but if their personal life becomes such as to endanger the standing and prestige of the party, that becomes a political question that we take into consideration.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, can you tell us why many Communist Party members who are citizens do not travel under their own passports?

Mr. BROWDER. I think it is largely because of the dangers of traveling abroad as a known Communist.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. But if they are going to Russia, why they have no occasion; they are not in danger there, are they?

Mr. BROWDER. No; but they have to travel through many other countries before they get there.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know George Mink?

Mr. BROWDER. I am familiar with the name.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know him personally?

Mr. BROWDER. Not personally; I have seen him.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have seen him?

Mr. BROWDER. Years ago.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he a member of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. No; not that I know of.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not that you know of?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know anything about his activities in this country or elsewhere?

Mr. BROWDER. Not for many years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not for many years?

Mr. BROWDER. I knew of him only when he was active in the organization of the Waterfront Workers' Clubs in New York, years ago.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what year was that?

Mr. BROWDER. 1929.

Mr. WHITLEY. At that time he was not a member of the Communist Party either of Russia or elsewhere?

Mr. BROWDER. At that time he was a member of the Communist Party, I believe.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. That was my impression; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did he ever hold any official position in the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether he holds any official position with the Communist Party in Russia, or elsewhere?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know about him since he left the United States; since 1930.

Mr. WHITLEY. What time?

Mr. BROWDER. 1930, I believe.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is not in the United States at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. I have not seen him or heard of him being here.

Mr. WHITLEY. To your knowledge, he is not in the United States at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. And if he was here on a party mission you would know it?

Mr. BROWDER. I certainly would.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or if he was here on behalf of the Communist Party of Russia or elsewhere?

Mr. BROWDER. I take it for granted I would.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether he is a relative of A. Lozovsky, who is now an assistant foreign commissar of the Soviet?

Mr. BROWDER. I have not the slightest reason to believe he is.

Mr. WHITLEY. George Mink was born in Russia, was he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you help him to obtain an American birth certificate, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You did not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is in charge, or what group or individuals in the Communist Party have charge of the false passport business, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. We have no false passport business.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Do you know Alexander Bittelman?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are his functions in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. A member of the political committee, and one of the editors of the Communist.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was he a delegate of the Comintern to India in 1930 and 1931?

Mr. BROWDER. Not that I know of.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not that you know of?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether he ever traveled under a false passport?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You don't know?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you think if he had that you would have known it?

Mr. BROWDER. I have no reason to know those things.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you would not approve of it, if you did know it?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know Harry Kwite?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are not acquainted with him?

Mr. BROWDER. I have heard the name.

Mr. WHITLEY. If he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. He is not.

Mr. WHITLEY. What relation is Sparks to Harry Kwite?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know of any relationship.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know of anyone by the name of "Sparks"?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Sparks is secretary of the Communist Party in Wisconsin.

Mr. WHITLEY. In Wisconsin?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. He was formerly the organizer of Boston, was he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he was in Boston for a short time.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is "Sparks" the party name for Kwite, or vice versa?

Mr. BROWDER. No. I am sure Sparks' name is not Kwite.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are sure Kwite has never used the name of "Sparks"?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I cannot answer for Kwite, but I never heard of it.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, what is Sparks' first name?

Mr. BROWDER. Ned, I believe.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether Harry Kwite was acting for the Comintern in India about the same time Alexander Bittelman was there?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't, no.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know about that?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether—you say Sparks is organizer in Wisconsin?

Mr. BROWDER. In Wisconsin.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has Sparks ever operated a shortwave radio for the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. In this country, or elsewhere?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know under what name he might have traveled between the United States and Moscow?

Mr. BROWDER. I have never heard of him traveling to Moscow.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, have you ever traveled under a false passport?

Mr. BROWDER. I have.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. When was that?

Mr. BROWDER. Some years ago.

Mr. WHITLEY. Under what name did you travel?

Mr. THOMAS. And what year; let us have the year.

Mr. BROWDER. I would prefer not to answer such questions.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, I submit that that is pertinent.

The CHAIRMAN. You are declining on the ground it might incriminate you?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I submit it is pertinent to this inquiry, because it has to do with the operations and activities of the party, and its officials and members.

Mr. BRODSKY. The objection is not on the ground of pertinency, but on the ground of incrimination, which is a good constitutional objection.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand the point. Well, we will pass that question up for the time being, and the Chair will take it under advisement.

Mr. STARNES. Under what name, Mr. Browder, did you travel?

Mr. BRODSKY. That same objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I should say the witness should answer these questions; that it is not for his attorney or someone else to answer for him.

Mr. BROWDER. I am answering on advice of counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand, this gentleman is your counsel?

Mr. BROWDER. My counsel; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He is the representative of yourself personally, and not the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Of myself personally.

Mr. STARNES. Let us get his name.

Mr. BRODSKY. Joseph R. Brodsky, 100 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, have you ever used the name of George Morris?

The CHAIRMAN. What was that?

Mr. WHITLEY. I asked Mr. Browder if he had ever used the name of George Morris.

Mr. BROWDER. The same answer as to the previous question.

Mr. WHITLEY. You decline to answer on the ground it might incriminate you?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever used the name of Stewart?

Mr. BROWDER. The same answer.

Mr. WHITLEY. The same answer?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. For the sake of the record: I understand the witness, upon advice of counsel, has declined to answer each one of these questions on the ground it might incriminate him, and he invokes his constitutional privilege.

Mr. BRODSKY. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever used the name of Dozenberg?

Mr. BROWDER. The same answer.

Mr. WHITLEY. You decline to answer on the same grounds?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't say "the same answer"; give specifically what the answer is.

Mr. BROWDER. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. DEMPSEY. On what ground—on the ground it would incriminate you?

Mr. BROWDER. On the ground of incrimination, and the constitutional ground.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you do admit you have traveled under false passports.

Mr. BRODSKY. The same objection.

Mr. THOMAS. He has already answered that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; he has already answered that question.

Mr. STARNES. Now, Mr. Browder, you stated this morning that you had traveled under assumed names, or under different names, and you told of two names, I believe, this morning. Will you mind stating for the record what other names you have traveled under, or used?

Mr. BROWDER. Anything relating to technical problems, that might cause me difficulties, I don't want to go into. Where you are dealing with political questions, such as original questions about names I wrote under, I am quite ready to answer. I wrote some years ago under the names of Ward and Dixon.

Mr. STARNES. You stated this morning, though, that you had been known by different names—other names than those.

Mr. BROWDER. I said every name I have ever wrote under, I have been known by somebody by that name.

Mr. WHITLEY. As I recall, I did not limit my question this morning to the names Mr. Browder had written under.

Mr. STARNES. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The record will speak for itself on that point.

Mr. STARNES. Yes; but based on that record, I have asked him to give the committee now some of the assumed names under which he traveled, or by which he has been known.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you repeat the question?

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Browder, will you please give some of the names under which you have traveled or by which you have been known or called, other than your own name?

Mr. BROWDER. I object to answering, and decline to answer, on the ground of incrimination; also, it is not pertinent to the inquiry.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, you rely again upon your constitutional prerogatives and decline to answer because of the fact that the answer might incriminate you?

Mr. BROWDER. And also it is not pertinent to the subject of the inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us pass that question for the time being.

Mr. MASON. That type of question?

The CHAIRMAN. As far as the pertinency of the question is concerned, the Chair holds it is pertinent; but as far as the other question is concerned, the Chair will take that under advisement.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, is one of the main tactics of the Communist Party known as the united front—participation in united-front organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. It is.

Mr. WHITLEY. And will you define for the committee—I think you have already given at least a partial definition—what you mean by “united-front organizations”?

Mr. BROWDER. I never use the term “united-front organizations.” I would say the united front is a tactic of joining with as many other people as possible who hold the same objective in view, for the gaining unitedly of that objective. And in relation to the Communist Party, it means specifically uniting with non-Communists on as broad a scale as possible for objectives which are not directly related to communism.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now when you refer to objectives that agree with Communist Party objectives, are you referring to immediate objectives, or ultimate objectives?

Mr. BROWDER. I am referring to immediate objectives which have no necessary and direct relation to communism, but which are held by Communists in common with large numbers of other people.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Now what do you mean—give us your definition or interpretation of “mass organizations.”

Mr. BROWDER. A mass organization is any organization that has masses of people in it.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. In other words, under your definition, a united front organization could be a mass organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Well—

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the united front is made up of organizations of various types?

Mr. BROWDER. It is very difficult to answer questions that are based upon certain stereotyped phrases which themselves represent complicated thoughts behind them which are not explained. And when you use those terms the way you do, it is clear you use them as synonymous for a whole conception which I do not hold.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the question as I phrased it you cannot answer?

Mr. BROWDER. I cannot answer “Yes” or “No.”

Mr. WHITLEY. I have not restricted you in any way or attempted to hold you to “Yes” or “No” answers, Mr. Browder.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand, the witness says the united front is composed of Communists, non-Communists, sympathizers, non-sympathizers—everyone that agrees upon a certain program.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. While the program may not be but only partially Communistic?

Mr. BROWDER. Or not at all Communistic.

The CHAIRMAN. Or not at all Communistic?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But if the Communist Party joins with it, it is because the Communist Party believes it tends ultimately to the promotion of the ends they are seeking?

Mr. BROWDER. Or if they just want to for its own sake.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. They may do it for two reasons; one is it tends ultimately to bring about Communism—

Mr. BROWDER. Or may be desirable of itself.

The CHAIRMAN. In and of itself?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, it is acceptable as useful to the Communist Party—one or the other, or both?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. The program of the group?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Counsel, right there, let me ask him to establish these facts: It is true, is it not, that the real theory of communism was expressed in the language "From everyone according to his ability and to everyone according to his needs"? That was the theory of communism, was it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I would say that was the slogan to popularly describe the character of the Communist regime, not the theory. The theory is much more complicated.

The CHAIRMAN. It was the slogan to describe what the Communist Party stood for?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right—the ultimate aim.

The CHAIRMAN. The ultimate aim?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And, of course, that has never been put into effect in Russia, up to this moment?

Mr. BROWDER. Not yet.

The CHAIRMAN. Not yet?

Mr. BROWDER. They have not got communism yet; they have socialism.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, they have a partial socialist state and, to some extent, a capitalistic state, do they not?

Mr. BROWDER. Well—

The CHAIRMAN. To the extent you have a difference in wages, that is capitalism, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. If that is your understanding of the term "capitalism."

The CHAIRMAN. But you do have wages in Russia, don't you?

Mr. BROWDER. But "capitalism" without "capitalists" is a strange feature, and they have no capitalists.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do have wages in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. We do have wages in Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. And have a difference in wages?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; a difference in wages.

The CHAIRMAN. They were put into effect recently?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Comparatively?

Mr. BROWDER. No; except under the military rule, when we had invasions, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. In what year did Russia begin wage differentials?

Mr. BROWDER. In 1921. But even before that there was never equality.

The CHAIRMAN. There was never equality in Russia; I will agree with you about that.

Mr. BROWDER. There is no equality about wages; there is only equality of the right to wages.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you also have private property, do you not, in the land?

Mr. BROWDER. Not in land.

The CHAIRMAN. They have abolished all private property?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did it take to abolish private property in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I think it was absolutely by one of the first decrees of the new Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you abolish it all at the same time?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And did you seize all private property by one process?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. It was a gradual process?

Mr. BROWDER. It was; the program of the new Government in the Soviet Union was a gradual process of socialization, but the invasions that took place in the war that followed quickly destroyed that program and forced wholesale socialism.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have never reached to this day the ideals of communism as preached by Marx, and Engels, or Lenin?

Mr. BROWDER. No. They are just on the way.

The CHAIRMAN. They are just on the way now?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And one of the ways was this recent pact with Germany?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, name some of the more successful united front organizations in which the Communist Party has participated.

Mr. BROWDER. You have already yourself previously named the organizations in which the Communist Party has participated and which are more or less successful mass organizations.

Mr. WHITLEY. The International Labor Defense: Is that one of the organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party is not officially in the International Labor Defense. It supports it.

Mr. WHITLEY. It supports it?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. The Communist Party was officially part of the American League for Peace and Democracy, but withdrew in 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ask him about the early labor organizations—the trade unions?

Mr. WHITLEY. I have got that as the next step in the questions. I am trying to keep these segregated by subject matter.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to know about the labor organization. I understand they once had their own labor organizations.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And those were abandoned, and I would like to know when they were abandoned.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the the next set of questions.

Getting back to the International Labor Defense, you say the Communist Party supports the International Labor Defense but is not officially a part of it?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the International Labor Defense is not in any way or to any extent under the control or domination of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No, no. It has its own independent attorney.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is entirely independent?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the Communist Party has no say-so in formulating the policies or the program of the International Labor Defense?

Mr. BROWDER. We make no attempt to make decisions for them. We sometimes make suggestions to people in it, and sometimes those suggestions are accepted; sometimes not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just like any other organization could make a suggestion, and they could take it or leave it?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are not in a position to exercise any degree of control or domination over that organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Not at all.

Mr. WHITLEY. The American League for Peace and Democracy was an organization which succeeded the American League Against War and Fascism?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you say that you and others formally participated, for the party, in its organization?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. He was a director?

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you hold any official position in that organization?

Mr. BROWDER. I was one of the vice presidents.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he not a director of it?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. You said that the Communist Party finally withdrew from that organization. When was that?

Mr. BROWDER. In 1937.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was it a public withdrawal?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; there was an agreement with the leaders of the organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. Since that time Communist Party leaders individually may belong to and participate in the work of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. But the party, as such, is not a part of the league?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not represented in the least.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Communist Party exercise any direction or control whatever over the policies, program, or operations of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. To the same extent that you have no control over the International Labor Defense, you have none over the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that the proportion of nonparty people in both organizations is overwhelming, although they are democratic organizations.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are not a medium through which any degree of control can be exercised over those organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; only by the influence of the reasonableness of our proposals.

Mr. WHITLEY. They are entirely independent organizations, formulate their own programs, and carry them out as they see fit?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about the International Workers Order? What control does the Communist Party have over that organization?

Mr. BROWDER. There are no relations between the two organizations as such.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Bedacht is general secretary of the I. W. O.?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is also chairman of a board in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he is.

Mr. WHITLEY. And a member of the national committee?

Mr. BROWDER. A member of the national committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. For a number of years?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. The I. W. O. organization is a fraternal insurance organization, and it has no connection whatever, you say, with the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. As such, it has not. Sometimes they invite a Communist speaker to address them, and some of the universities do also, but for that they are not Communist organizations.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Communist Party has some members who belong to the I. W. O. as individuals?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know, approximately, how many there are?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; I cannot give any sort of exact figure. My assistant informs me, to my surprise, that about 3 percent of the I. W. O. membership are Communist members. I would have expected it to be more, or at least 10 percent. I myself am a member of the I. W. O.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you hold any official position in the I. W. O.?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; I just had a membership in the organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say that the Communist Party is not in a position through any channels or any sources or resources to control the I. W. O. in any way?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; it is not in such a position.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say that its programs and policies are handled by it as an independent organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about the American Youth Congress? What sort of a relationship does the Communist Party, or the Young Communist League, have with the American Youth Congress?

Mr. BROWDER. The relation, so far as the Young Communist League is concerned, is that of a participating organization and of support of the general program. So far as the Communist Party is concerned, we have no direct relation, but we have an attitude of benevolent support.

Mr. WHITLEY. You approve it?

Mr. BROWDER. We approve the congress.

Mr. WHITLEY. You approve its objectives?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Communist Party and the Young Communist League are just one among many participating organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party is not participating, but the Young Communist League is.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of course, I mean through the Young Communist League.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Young Communist League, as a minority, is not in a position to use the American Youth Congress for the purposes of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; it is a distinct minority.

Mr. WHITLEY. All of those organizations I have named are in the same category, in that the Communist Party does not exercise any control over them?

Mr. BROWDER. That is true.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is the American Students Union in the same category?

Mr. BROWDER. It is in the same category, except that it is a much smaller organization. When you deal with the American Youth Congress, you are dealing with 1,000,000 people, while the American Students organization, I believe, has not more than 30 or 35 thousand members. It is an organization of about the same relative weight in membership as the Young Communist League, but the Young Communist League has only a small proportion of its members as students.

Mr. WHITLEY. Referring to the American Students Union, is the Young Communist League in a position, with its members participating in the program of the American Students Union, to control that organization, or is the Communist Party, as such, through the Young Communist League, or through any other channels or organization, in a position to exercise control over the programs or policies of the American Students Union?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; none whatever.

Mr. WHITLEY. Referring to the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, what are the relations between the Communist Party and that organization?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party approves and supports the objectives of the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is an entirely independent organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; it is entirely independent.

Mr. WHITLEY. And it is not under the control of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. What about the Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy?

Mr. BROWDER. It has the same relation. The Communist Party approves its objectives and supports its work.

Mr. WHITLEY. But it exercises no control over it?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. What about the American Negro Labor Congress? What are the relations or connection between the Communist Party and that organization?

Mr. BROWDER. It is the same relation.

Mr. WHITLEY. You approve it?

Mr. BROWDER. It does approve and support its work, but we have no control over it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you have anything to do with the organization, or the setting up of the organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Some of our leading members took part in the formulation of the plans for it, among the leaders being James W. Ford, candidate for Vice President on the Communist ticket.

Mr. WHITLEY. But it is an entirely separate and independent organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about the Friends of the Soviet Union, or what is the relation between the Communist Party and that organization?

Mr. BROWDER. None. I doubt if we have a single party member in it. There may be two or three.

Mr. WHITLEY. As a matter of fact, that organization has become increasingly inactive, has it not?

Mr. BROWDER. It has never been a very active organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not since the United States recognized the Soviet Union. Since that time it has been more or less inactive.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; it does a little work. It is a relatively small group of people.

Mr. WHITLEY. Its objective was to gain recognition for the Soviet Union, and since recognition was given it has become increasingly inactive.

Mr. BROWDER. I would not attempt to analyze the history of the organization. I have not been close enough to it.

Mr. WHITLEY. But during the life of the organization the relationship between the Communist Party and that organization was the same as you have described with reference to the other organizations mentioned?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about the League of American Writers?

Mr. BROWDER. It is the same relationship, except here, in the interest of full clarity and frankness, I should state that I have a personal relation to the League of American Writers and that I was invited to address their first two congresses.

Mr. WHITLEY. When was that organized?

Mr. BROWDER. I think in 1937 or 1936. As a writer and associated with some writers, I was closely in touch with that organization. I accepted its invitations and spoke there at times when other political organizations did not accept and that made our relations friendly. In the past 2 years I have had very little time to give personal attention to it. The party as an organization does not have anything to do with it.

Mr. THOMAS. Who was the head of that organization at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. I really cannot say who the officers were.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you recall who introduced you on the night you spoke?

Mr. BROWDER. Do you mean at the Carnegie Hall meeting?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. Donald Ogden Stuart. He was the chairman and was later elected president of the league.

Mr. THOMAS. He did not introduce you both times, did he?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not sure.

Mr. THOMAS. Not according to the Daily Worker.

Mr. BROWDER. If the Daily Worker says otherwise, it is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. It is my recollection that the Daily Worker—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). That is an accurate publication, is it?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. According to my recollection, the Daily Worker stated on numerous occasions that a man by the name of Archibald MacLeish introduced you.

Mr. BROWDER. Then, that is correct. In answer to the question with regard to the first meeting of the American Writers League, I am sorry I cannot remember who was chairman. I think you are correct as to Mr. McLeish. The chairman, Donald Stuart, was elected president of the League.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that many of your sympathizers and many of your members owe their favorable feeling to the fact that your party was very much opposed to nazi-ism? Did not other people join with you, not primarily because they were favorable to communism, but because they looked upon your party as the arch foe of nazi-ism?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And when I say nazi-ism I mean also fascism.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; nazi-ism is one variety of fascism.

The CHAIRMAN. Many people in the Communist Party are very much opposed to fascism, and they see in your party an arch foe of fascism. Is that not a fact?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that is so.

The CHAIRMAN. They see your party as a militant fighting force against fascism?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; it unites them in the work against nazi-ism and fascism.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore, they contribute their money and join in the work because of their opposition to fascism and nazi-ism?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that probably plays quite a role in it.

Mr. VOORHIS. Would you say that you have found it easier to build up your movement on the basis of opposition to nazi-ism rather than on the basis of the positive appeal of communism?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that the anti-Fascist sentiment in America embraces an overwhelming majority of the people, whereas those who believe in communism represent a small minority.

Mr. VOORHIS. In other words, in a movement of this kind, there might be a great many people who are connected with it who would not have any sympathy whatsoever with the objectives of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Of course; yes, sir.

Mr. VOORHIS. Does it not make it difficult for you to carry on anti-fascist work at present, in view of the agreement between Russia and Germany?

Mr. BROWDER. I would be glad indeed to discuss that question.

Mr. VOORHIS. Is it not, at least, hard, or is it not a tough thing to get around?

Mr. BROWDER. I tell you frankly that I will be quite happy before the conclusion of this testimony to discuss that. I think it is quite pertinent to the inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you will be happy to do that?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; I would like to explain why. It is pertinent to the inquiry.

Mr. THOMAS. At the present time we are trying to find out the various organizations.

Mr. BROWDER. I will be happy to do that later on.

The CHAIRMAN. You will give us your own viewpoint?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; I will give my own viewpoint, and from the standpoint of the American national interests.

The CHAIRMAN. Would that coincide with the viewpoint of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; I will give you my position, and will discuss it from the standpoint of the American national interests.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were discussing the relation of the Communist Party to the League of American Writers. Other than the fact that you have addressed them, I believe you stated, at two of their conventions, the Communist Party is not in a position to exercise any control over that organization?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; it is not.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is an entirely independent organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. I am hoping to become a member of it some time. I have not gotten around to it yet.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is in the same category with the other organizations I have mentioned, so far as being subject to Communist control is concerned?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. We consider that any organization controlled by the Communist Party is a failure.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you mean if it is known?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; if it is controlled.

Mr. WHITLEY. There is a big difference between control and known control.

Mr. BROWDER. We consider the control of any organization by the Communist Party means that—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). If it were controlled in such a manner that it could be effectively denied, it would not mean that.

Mr. BROWDER. It would still be so.

Mr. VOORHIS. You would not want any one of these organizations to adopt a policy that was opposed to your general program?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; but if we controlled them, it would be bad for us. They would rely on our control to convince the people, whereas if we do not control them, they will go to work.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not object to controlling them or having them take the same point of view that you have?

Mr. BROWDER. That is what brings us together in the same organization.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, the fact that you have the same viewpoint?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. People who do not agree with the objectives of an organization do not get together much.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not be in this organization unless there was a unity of feeling?

Mr. BROWDER. Something in common; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not begun to meet with any Nazi groups or Fascist groups? You do not meet with Deatherage or any of those groups?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The reason you meet with the other group is because of a similarity of viewpoint, or because you have an objective in common?

Mr. BROWDER. They have certain things in common.

Mr. WHITLEY. What about the relation between the Communist Party and the League of Women Shoppers?

Mr. BROWDER. There is none.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are any members of the Communist Party members of that organization?

Mr. BROWDER. On general principles, I assume that we have some.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is in the same category with the other organizations I have mentioned, so far as Communist influence or control is concerned?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. VOORHIS. Do you mean that the League of Women Shoppers has the same relationship to the Communist Party that the American League for Peace and Democracy has?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; not exactly the same.

Mr. VOORHIS. As a matter of fact, it is quite different, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. As to the American League for Peace and Democracy, the Communist Party at one time belonged to it, whereas it never has had any relation whatever with the League of Women Shoppers.

Mr. WHITLEY. It has had relations to the same extent it has had with the others mentioned, with the exception of the American League for Peace and Democracy. That is, it has individual members in it.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. The American League for Peace and Democracy is different in that one respect, or your relations with the League for Peace and Democracy are different in that one respect, in that at one time you were officially affiliated with it as a party.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. With those other organizations, you do not have any such official affiliation?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; that is true.

Mr. WHITLEY. Participation is the measure of it, and the fact that individual members of the Communist Party may belong to those organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you hold any official position in any of that group of organizations I have named, other than, I believe you stated, you were vice president of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. At one time I think you mentioned the International Labor Defense, and I think I was on the national board.

Mr. STARNES. I think you said you were one of the founders.

Mr. BROWDER. That was an organization that preceded it and that was merged with it.

Mr. WHITLEY. They are the only two in which you have held an official position?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. In which group, if any, did the Communist Party, as such, actively participate in the forming of the organization?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party was one of the organizations that came together and formed the committee for the first congress set up by the American League.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was the League Against War and Fascism?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; we worked together with the Socialist Party and a dozen other organizations and different societies.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you actively participate, as an organization, in the formation of any of those other groups?

Mr. BROWDER. None of the others that you have mentioned.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is the head of the International Labor Defense?

Mr. BROWDER. The president of the International Labor Defense is Congressman Vito Marcantonio.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is general secretary?

Mr. BROWDER. Anna Damon.

Mr. WHITLEY. She is the active administrative official of the organization?

Mr. BROWDER. She is the executive in charge of the office.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long has she been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know. She has been a member for a number of years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did she ever hold any official position in the party?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know whether she was a member or an officer of the national committee of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. She may have been. I would hesitate to say positively one way or the other.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is the head of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. BROWDER. The secretary, I believe, is Reverend Harris. I forget his first name. It is Thomas, I believe. The president is Rev. Harry F. Ward.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is either of those officers a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. They are not members of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Referring to the International Workers Order, I believe you stated that the general secretary was a member of the national committee of the Communist Party. Who are the other officers of the organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. William Weiner is president.

Mr. WHITLEY. And he is financial secretary of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who are the officers of the American Youth Congress?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with their names or the positions that they hold. I have a few of the names. I have a few of them.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Joseph Cadden?

Mr. BROWDER. He is one of the most prominent people in it. I do not know his exact office.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is the head of the American Students Union?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe the secretary of that, or the chairman of it, or the outstanding leader of it, is Mr. Joseph Lash.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he also a member of the Young Communist League?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Has he ever been?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir. He is a Socialist, who, on account of his stand for maintaining the Students Union as a united organization, was excluded from the Socialist Party. The Socialists wanted a divided organization, and he refused to do it. He is, therefore, quite friendly to the Communist Party, which supported the united organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe the retiring president of the National Lawyers Guild, Judge Ferdinand Pecora, last winter publicly charged in the press of the United States that the National Lawyers Guild was Communist controlled or dominated. What are the relations between the Communist Party and the National Lawyers Guild?

Mr. BROWDER. There are no relations between the Communist Party and the National Lawyers Guild.

Mr. WHITLEY. It exercises no control of any kind over the guild?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir. They are ridiculous charges.

Mr. WHITLEY. Coming from the retiring president, I think it would be a good source for such a statement. Are you acquainted with a party by the name of Ewart, a former member of the German Reichstag?

Mr. BROWDER. I have met him.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. He is a member of the Communist Party of Germany.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has he ever been a member in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know where he is?

Mr. BROWDER. I understand that he is in prison in Brazil.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has he ever been active in this country as a member of the Communist Party of the United States or the Communist Party of any other country?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. How much time did he spend in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know that he was ever in this country. I met him in Germany and in Moscow.

Mr. WHITLEY. He was active in Germany, was he not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know what he is in jail for in Brazil at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know what the charges are. He was jailed in connection with some trouble that took place in Brazil many years ago.

Mr. WHITLEY. Related to Communist Party activities?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; on account of the National Union, I think. It was the one headed by Prestes. He was in Brazil, in touch with Prestes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether he ever traveled on an American passport?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you familiar with the trade-union department of the party? The Communist Party had its own trade-union, or organized the Trade Union Unity League.

Mr. BROWDER. We had our own trade-unions. There were trade-unions organized largely under the stimulus of the Communist Party among workers, but they were independent trade-union organizations, not connected with the Communist Party, although the Communist Party gave most of the stimulus to their organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. They gave the T. U. U. L. unions their full support, did they not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Were the T. U. U. L. unions members of the Red International Labor Union?

Mr. BROWDER. The executive committee set up by the T. U. U. L. had made such a decision, but the decision was never ratified by the constituent organizations, some of whom objected to it, and the decision was later canceled.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, was the T. U. U. L. a part of or identified with the R. I. L. U., or was it not?

Mr. BROWDER. The executive committee was identified, but its constituent bodies were not.

Mr. WHITLEY. What status would that place it in? Was it or was it not a part of the organization? In other words, if the executive body says "yes," the constituents say "no." Now, where did that place it?

Mr. BROWDER. That placed it in a division of authority, and they solved it by canceling the affiliation.

Mr. WHITLEY. The affiliation was canceled?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. The affiliation with the R. I. L. U.?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. It was much the same as a deadlock between the President and Congress, which sometimes cancels out decisions of the American Government.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, how long did the unions of this country operate under the T. U. U. L.; that is, how long were those T. U. U. L. unions operative or active?

Mr. BROWDER. The history of each one would have to be taken separately to give an accurate instance.

Mr. WHITLEY. But how long was it from the first of those unions until the time they were dissolved or ceased to exist?

Mr. BROWDER. The first of those organizations were established in 1929. The last of these organizations was merged with the American Federation of Labor in 1935.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you ever hold any official position in the T. U. U. L.?

Mr. BROWDER. I was a member of the executive committee that was first set up.

Mr. WHITLEY. And how long did you hold that position?

Mr. BROWDER. A couple of years; until I became active in the secretaryship of the Communist Party, and then I got out of that.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were a representative to conventions or meetings in Moscow with reference to the activities of those unions?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know that I ever was a representative in any Moscow gathering for those unions.

Mr. WHITLEY. I thought this morning you stated that the occasion of one of your trips to Moscow was—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). That was when I was representing an organization which had gone out of business at the time you speak of. That was the Trade Union Educational League.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. What was the relationship between the R. I. L. U., the Red International of Labor Unions, and the Comintern? They both had their headquarters in Moscow. Organizationally they were separate and distinct, just as organizationally the Communist Party in this country is separate and distinct from the publishing company that puts out the Daily Worker. But what were the relations between the Communist International and the R. I. L. U. during the period of that organization's existence?

Mr. BROWDER. There was a period of general agreement about the main political outlines of the problems of the working class.

Mr. WHITLEY. As a matter of fact, Mr. Browder, the Red International of Labor Unions was an instrument or an organization of the Comintern, was it not?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I would not agree with that kind of description.

Mr. WHITLEY. Well, if you would not say that that was strictly or technically correct, what was the extent of the relationship?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not agree with it, because it would carry implications which would not be correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. I do not want any implications, but I just want to get the relationship.

Mr. BROWDER. But if you use certain implications, you do not get the relationship. When you say, for example, that the Red International of Labor Unions was the instrument of the Communist International, that implies a certain role of a passive tool in the hands of an active force.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what was the active force?

Mr. BROWDER. There were two forces. In the International of Labor Unions there were representatives of trade unions, making their own trade-union decisions.

Mr. STARNES. Were they in agreement about policies?

Mr. BROWDER. They had general agreement about general policies.

Mr. STARNES. And, of course, as regards the tactics to be pursued, they were in general agreement?

Mr. BROWDER. There was quite a distinct division of functions between them. They were not identical so that one could be called an instrument of the other.

Mr. STARNES. I understand that. We have got that distinction. But what I want to know is whether there was a general agreement of purpose between the two organizations.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; there was an absence of any political struggle between them.

Mr. STARNES. I understand that; but were the tactics to be pursued the same?

Mr. BROWDER. As far as tactics are concerned, these were decided by each organization separately. One was the organization of political parties, which uses one kind of tactics, and the other was the organization of trade unions, which uses another kind of tactics.

Mr. STARNES. But it did lead to the same general objective?

Mr. BROWDER. In the same general direction; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the same degree of relationship and cooperation existed between the Communist Party of the United States and the T. U. U. L. unions in this country, which were a branch of the R. I. L. U.?

Mr. BROWDER. So far as personnel is concerned, I think that we can say that our relations were closer to the T. U. U. L., because the unions were smaller than those involved in Europe.

Mr. WHITLEY. You considered them your unions, did you not, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You repeatedly referred to them in your publications as the Communist Party unions.

Mr. BROWDER. No; hardly that. Sometimes—they were called so much the Communist unions in the public press that we sometimes fell into the influence of this public labeling; but as a matter of fact we were always striving to keep them on a completely independent basis.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. The reference to them as Communist Party unions in the press was taken up by your own publications?

Mr. BROWDER. There was some reflection of it in our press.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You were a victim of propaganda, in other words?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. They were boring from within the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, they were also referred to frequently in your official press as the revolutionary trade unions, were they not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, those independent unions continued to operate until—I believe you stated a moment ago—nineteen hundred and—

Mr. BROWDER. 1934-35. Perhaps I should add that when they were called revolutionary unions that was a mistake. They were called that, but they were not.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you called them that yourself; that is, the party press did.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the mistake?

Mr. BROWDER. The mistake was that they were not revolutionary.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was before the party line changed in 1935, was it not, Mr. Browder, that they were called revolutionary unions?

Mr. BROWDER. They were called revolutionary unions while they existed; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And why were the independent T. U. U. L. unions abandoned or discarded?

Mr. BROWDER. Because the conditions which gave rise to them began to disappear.

The CHAIRMAN. What conditions?

Mr. BROWDER. The conditions under which these unions were built were those that existed in 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932, in which the established labor movement refused to organize, refused to lead the workers who were trying to organize and who were entering into struggles. They did not want new members and, especially, they did not want new unions which were striking. Therefore, in order for these workers to be organized at all, they had to be organized in independent unions. But with 1932—well, I would say more in 1933—when they began the big movement of the masses into the old established trade unions, this gradually began to change their attitude toward the whole question of organizing the unorganized. Instead of rejecting these groups they began to invite them to come in and, as soon as they began to open the doors to these unions and invite them to join, the Communists and non-Communists in these unions rapidly agreed that the thing to do was to bring these small unions into the big organization and wipe out this movement; and that was done.

Mr. THOMAS. What was the name of that big organization?

Mr. BROWDER. The American Federation of Labor.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, in other words, when the independent or separate unions were disbanded, the membership was absorbed into the A. F. of L.?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Were the members of the T. U. U. L. unions instructed to get into the A. F. of L. in every case possible?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, the Communist Party does not have the habit of issuing instructions or orders on any such question. It only gives advice.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just a suggestion?

Mr. BROWDER. Suggestions or advice.

Mr. WHITLEY. If that suggestion is not taken, what happens?

Mr. BROWDER. Then it is not taken.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Counsel, do we understand that this absorption of these independent unions into the A. F. of L. took place in 1935, approximately?

Mr. WHITLEY. 1934 and 1935; is not that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. In 1934 and 1935.

Mr. MASON. Just previous to the growth or expansion of the industrial unions?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. I believe there was a further great growth of the movement in the period 1935-36.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, does the Communist Party of the United States make a particular effort to control, or at least have an influential membership in, the trade unions in certain industries?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party absolutely does not seek to control any trade union; it does not want to control.

Mr. WHITLEY. For the same reason, it does not want to control these organizations that we have referred to?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party tries to extend the influence of its ideas among workers everywhere.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has it ever taken the position that it was particularly desirable for its members to be active in trade unions, say, in the maritime industry or other transportation industries?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes. We have always emphasized the basic importance of particular industries, those upon which the economy of the country is built. These are the most important industries.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about munitions—the munition industries?

Mr. BROWDER. Munitions we have never given a great deal of attention to, largely because there has not been effective trade-union organization in that field.

Mr. WHITLEY. Communications; have you made any particular effort to get members in the communications field or communications trade unions?

Mr. BROWDER. No. Our concentration efforts have been directed toward basic industries.

Mr. WHITLEY. What percentage of the former membership of your own labor organization—and, if you object to that designation, I will say the former membership of the T. U. U. L. labor organizations—is now affiliated with the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O.?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, of all that went into the A. F. of L., it is very difficult to say how much is in the C. I. O. because all these organizations grew very much even before the C. I. O. was formed.

Mr. WHITLEY. What percentage of your present membership, Mr. Browder, in lines of work where they can get into trade unions, are presently active trade unionists?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, I would say about 75 percent of those who have trade unions to which they are eligible members.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the trade unions?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what is the percentage, approximately, of your membership in the A. F. of L. unions and in the C. I. O. unions?

Mr. BROWDER. The largest part of our membership is in the industries where the C. I. O. unions control—the basic industries, the mass-production industries. But, of course, we have a considerable number in the skilled crafts also that are in the A. F. of L. but their numbers are naturally smaller. I would say perhaps the ratio is 2 to 1.

Mr. STARNES. Do you have any leaders of the Communist Party who are leaders or heads of the American Federation of Labor or any of its groups?

Mr. BROWDER. Well we have on a local scale.

Mr. STARNES. You do not on a national scale; do you?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. And you do not have any organizers in the A. F. of L., do you?

Mr. BROWDER. On a local scale; yes.

Mr. STARNES. But not on a national scale?

Mr. BROWDER. No; not on a national scale.

Mr. STARNES. That statement, however, is not true when applied to the C. I. O., is it?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, no. In the C. I. O. we have, for example, the fur workers' union, the president of which is a Communist and a member of our national committee; but that does not mean anything from the angle from which you are approaching this.

Mr. STARNES. No; I am merely asking you the question; that is all; and I do not care for anything further.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. The fact is that he was the president of the union in the A. F. of L. and became president of the union in the C. I. O.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not the truth about the thing—that you had many party members who were well trained in trade-union work, organizational work, and that they were well qualified to step into the roles of organizers when this mass movement started?

Mr. BROWDER. Naturally they went where their services were needed, where people were being organized in new unions.

The CHAIRMAN. And your men had been well trained; had they not?

Mr. BROWDER. Some of them.

The CHAIRMAN. But they were better trained than those who were not members of the party; were they not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Because you concentrated much of your effort toward training men for trade-union work?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That was one of the principal activities that you engaged in?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And naturally in this mass organization, along industrial organization lines, your men being prepared, they stepped into the roles of organizers and officials; is not that true?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; our people had been trained for many years; they had been trained in the thought of industrial unionism and mass organization.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, what is the purpose, the real purpose, of the Communist Party in its efforts to get its members into trade unions and to have them active in trade-union work? Is it to help improve the conditions of the workers, or is it to promote and further the ideas of Communism?

Mr. BROWDER. It is both, the two go together.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. It is both to improve the conditions of the workers, to help establish orderly relations in industry, to avoid confusion and unnecessary strife, and on that basis—

Mr. WHITLEY. Make every effort to avoid unnecessary strife?

Mr. BROWDER. Absolutely. I want to emphasize that.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us see if this is correct. You had had workers' schools in existence prior to 1935, or the 1934-35 period, when this mass organization started in the United States; did you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And in these workers' schools many of your party members had been trained especially along organizational lines; is not that true?

Mr. BROWDER. Not so much in the schools. In the schools they were mostly trained in the books. They got their training in organization in the field.

The CHAIRMAN. So that in the big industrial centers you had a great many men who were well trained along that line?

Mr. BROWDER. Quite a few; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And in the mass organization of these workers there was a scarcity of trained organizers, was there not?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And they naturally turned to your party to supply this need; is not that a fact?

Mr. BROWDER. I think it is more correct to say that they just took the best material wherever they found it.

The CHAIRMAN. And you happened to have the best material at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. We gave them some good material.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Browder, is it the case, as a general rule, that these men, when they entered actively into the larger union movement, did not go as Communists; they merely went as John Jones, or whoever it was?

Mr. BROWDER. Of course; like everybody else does.

Mr. VOORHIS. Was that a policy?

Mr. BROWDER. Ben Smith does not go in as a Democrat either; he goes in as a union worker. The fact that he is a Democrat is nobody's business.

Mr. WHITLEY. But he does not deny that he is a Democrat?

Mr. BROWDER. Sometimes he does; and in the South he certainly denies it if he is a Republican. He is afraid.

Mr. WHITLEY. If he denies it, it is a personal decision on his part; and he has no instructions to deny it. I mean, there is no active attempt on his part to conceal any political affiliations? Is that true in the Communist Party also?

Mr. BROWDER. That is true also.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Communist Party does not instruct its members to conceal their affiliations?

Mr. BROWDER. No, no.

Mr. WHITLEY. And it does not, as a part of that instruction, encourage the use of party names or fictitious names?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that conclude your examination, Mr. Whitley?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We will meet in the morning at 10 o'clock and resume the questioning.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 6, 1939, at 10 a. m.)

# INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1939

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 10 a. m. in the caucus room, House Office Building, Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Mr. Matthews, you may proceed.

## TESTIMONY OF EARL R. BROWDER—Resumed

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, you stated yesterday, I believe, that the Communist Party had supported the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act, among its support of other pieces of legislation which had been adopted in recent years; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall that William Dunne appeared as an official representative of the Communist Party before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor to make a statement concerning the pending National Labor Relations Act?

Mr. BROWDER. I recall that William Dunne made an appearance ostensibly on behalf of the party, but he did not place the party position correctly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When he vigorously opposed the pending legislation, he was not representing the Communist Party; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Dunne said:

It is in the name of the Communist Party which I represent here—

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was this statement prepared by Mr. Dunne personally or by some committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Dunne personally.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Mr. Dunne taken to task in any manner for misrepresenting the party's attitude on this question?

Mr. BROWDER. The action that was taken was to cease allowing him to speak in the name of the party, and to make our statements through other channels.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said yesterday that while you knew of a certain Mr. Randolph who had been in Moscow, you did not know him by any other name. Is that still your answer to that question?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did Mr. Randolph occupy any important position in the Communist International at any time?

Mr. BROWDER. He signed some documents of the Communist International, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he ever placed on the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he was on the presidium of one of the meetings, but not on the Executive Committee as a permanent proposition.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Reading from the International Press Correspondence of July 24, 1929, the following statement appeared:

The plenum extended the Presidium of the Executive Committee, Communist International, by adding to it Comrades Garlandi, Italy; Gottwold, Czechoslovakia; Randolph, United States.

Is it possible, Mr. Browder, that any individual who had ever been placed so high in the Communist International would not be known to you under his correct name if, by any chance, he were using a name other than his own in this connection?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not understand the question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were in Moscow at the time of this meeting of the executive committee of the Communist International, were you not?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know which meeting you refer to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is the meeting in midsummer 1929. It is dated Moscow, July 20, 1929.

Mr. BROWDER. At that time I was not there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were not there?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you not know, Mr. Browder, that this Randolph was Robert Minor?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know that?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is Robert Minor a member of the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. He is a member of the national committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know, or do you not know, that Mr. Minor has on other occasions used the alias of Randolph?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You stated yesterday, Mr. Browder, that you do not know who edits a publication known as the New South. Do you now know who edits that publication?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I have not got a copy of it with me, and I am not familiar with it. I have not been in close touch with that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it refresh your memory if I told you that Paul Crouch is listed as the editor?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that would probably be correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of that publication?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You recall, do you not, that Paul Crouch has for many years occupied a rather prominent position in the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. He has been a member for many years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know that some years ago when he was in the armed forces of the United States, stationed in Hawaii, he was court-martialed for his Communist activities in the Army and received a sentence of 40 years?

Mr. BROWDER. I am familiar with that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, right at that point, I thought Mr. Browder made the statement yesterday that the Communist Party was not active in the Army at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. He said up until 1933; after 1933 he said they ceased to be active; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct. And, furthermore, Mr. Crouch joined the party after his release from that sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Mr. Crouch one of the leaders in the Southern Conference on Human Welfare held in Birmingham, Ala., last year?

Mr. BROWDER. Not that I know of. He may have been present, but I never heard of his name in connection with leadership.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you not read in the Daily Worker that Mr. Crouch headed one of the commissions of that conference on behalf of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not notice that he headed one of the commissions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, at the tenth convention of the Communist Party of the United States in 1938 Joseph Stalin was elected to the honorary presiding committee of that convention, was he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the response which the name of Joseph Stalin brought from the delegates to that convention?

Mr. BROWDER. I would imagine that it would be greeted with great applause. I do not recall the exact circumstances, but I suppose that is what you have in mind, and that is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The words "tremendous ovation" would not be an exaggeration?

Mr. BROWDER. Would not be an exaggeration.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of the reception which was given his name?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At the same convention, was there a cablegram sent to Dimitroff hailing his leadership of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe there was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did that cablegram state on behalf of the American Communist Party, as follows [reading]:

At the Seventh Congress of the Communist International under your leadership we learned how that victory could be attained.

Mr. BROWDER. I think that is a correct quotation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, have you ever stated that a Soviet America would correspond in every detail to Soviet Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From your book entitled, "What Is Communism?" published in 1936 by the Workers Library Publishers, New York, chapter 21, entitled "A Glimpse of Soviet America," I read:

The principles upon which a Soviet America would be organized would be the same in every respect as those which guided the Soviet Union.

That was the statement made by you.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. I said the principles, not the details. Your question was about details and forms. I said the principles.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are acquainted with the book which William Z. Foster wrote entitled "From Bryan to Stalin," are you not?

Mr. BROWDER. I have read it. I have not studied it carefully.

Mr. STARNES. What Bryan?

The CHAIRMAN. William Jennings Bryan.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From the text I gather it is William Jennings Bryan. This book deals with the political situation in the United States from the standpoint of the chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, does it not, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. It is a historical review.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of the conditions in the United States from the standpoint of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Particularly from the evolution of a political position of the author. It is a personal book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that study takes up the period which Mr. Foster describes as one which began with the Populist movement under William Jennings Bryan, and ends with the appearance of Joseph Stalin as a figure important in some respects in the American situation; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is in a general way a description.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yesterday, Mr. Browder, you identified for the record Alexander Bittelman, or perhaps it is Alex Bittelman. You are acquainted with the writings of Mr. Bittelman?

Mr. BROWDER. I am.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Bittelman, in fact, is one of the editors of the publication *The Communist*, is he not?

Mr. BROWDER. He is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of which you are also an editor?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know Mr. Bittelman's pamphlet entitled, "Milestones in the History of the Communist Party"?

Mr. BROWDER. I am familiar with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has the Communist Party of the United States through its leaders and publications, made frequent reference to the leadership of the Comintern in the affairs of the American Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Very frequently.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I read you from the pamphlet by Alex Bittelman, page 71:

The leading role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the Comintern needs neither explanation nor apology.

That is a correct statement as of the present date?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Again reading from page 87 of the same pamphlet:

Will the unemployed American workers, who know these facts, as well as the class-conscious employed workers, resent this "interference" of the Comintern in American affairs? No; they will not; they will say, "If this is what Comintern leadership means, we are all for it \* \* \*."

Does this statement represent the attitude of the Communist Party toward the so-called interference of the Comintern in American affairs?

Mr. BROWDER. That by itself; no; not as an isolated sentence. That is only a polemic in answer—

Mr. MATTHEWS. In some respects, however, it does represent the viewpoint—

Mr. BROWDER. As a polemic, as an answer to a charge which raises the term "interference," and answering it and using the term in quotation marks. The Communist Party of the United States has never been interfered with.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it true that the Comintern has ever spoken to the American party with authority?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist International has spoken to the American party expressing views which carried great moral authority.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I read you from—

Mr. BROWDER. It has never spoken with organizational authority.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That answers the question. I read you from Mr. Bittelman's pamphlet again:

Because the Comintern spoke to the American party with authority and wisdom; in so speaking, in pointing out the dangers and the way to avoid them, the Comintern released the initiative and creative activity of the overwhelming majority of the party \* \* \*.

And again:

The Comintern did "interfere"; there can be no doubt of that. And it is fortunate that it did.

Is that a correct statement?

Mr. BROWDER. That in relation to the facts with which it deals, that the Comintern, at the moment in which Mr. Bittelman is writing about, the Comintern intervened decisively to unmask a fraudulent position that was put forward, representing to be its position in the United States. The Comintern unmasked that fraud. In that sense it was an interference, an interference with the fraud.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not interested for the moment in the reasons for the interference, but in the fact of the interference.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; interfered in the sense of intervened, expressed itself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I read again from Mr. Bittelman's pamphlet:

In the 15 years of its existence the Comintern has grown into a true world party. It has reached the high stage where all Communist parties are carrying out one single line of the Comintern \* \* \*.

Does that statement require any kind of a context in order to make it say something other than is apparent on the surface?

Mr. BROWDER. It could be deepened. It is a very bald statement. It is a correct statement, that the parties of the Communist International—that is, all the Communist Parties of the world—are in full agreement on their main line of approach to the world situation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have here another pamphlet, also by Alex Bittelman, entitled "The Communist Party in Action." This is also published by the Workers Library Publishers. In chapter 3, page 33, we find the following language:

What is the nature of membership in the Communist Party? This is well stated in the Constitution and Rules of the Communist International.

By nature of membership in the Communist Party, Mr. Bittelman means membership in the Communist Party of the United States, does he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I presume so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Again:

This is well stated in the Constitution and Rules of the Communist International, paragraph 3, which reads as follows:

"Membership in the Communist Party and in the Communist International is open to all those who accept the program and rules of the given Communist party and of the Communist International, who join one of the basic units of a Party, actively work in it, abide by all decisions of the Party and of the Communist International, and regularly pay party dues."

That is the end of the quotation from the constitution of the Communist International. Continuing the words of Mr. Bittelman:

You will observe that all of the specific requirements for membership in the party aim at one thing, namely, the active, conscious, and disciplined participation in the struggles of the masses that are led and organized by the Party.

If, as you stated yesterday, Mr. Browder, the Communist Party of the United States is not and never has been under the formal statutes of the Communist International or its constitution, what is the relevance of quoting a paragraph from the constitution of the Communist International in order to clarify the nature of membership in the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. On the same principle that arguments in law before American courts can quote statutes and precedents of other countries as developing and exemplifying principles and practices of a similar nature.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I call your attention, however, to the fact that after quoting that statute from the constitution of the Communist International, Mr. Bittelman refers to it as setting forth specific requirements for membership in the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. BROWDER. I am not sure that that is a correct interpretation; but if it is, that was a mistake.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is a mistake? Was Mr. Bittelman reminded of the fact that he made a mistake?

Mr. BROWDER. My attention was not called to it before, until you called my attention to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us see. When was that pamphlet published?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This pamphlet is dated May 1934.

The CHAIRMAN. 1934?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And your explanation of that is that Mr. Bittelman either did not know what he was talking about or misstated the facts, is that it?

Mr. BROWDER. No. I said that if Mr. Matthews' interpretation of that is correct, then it was a mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. Read it again and let us see if there is any question about the interpretation.

Mr. THOMAS. Let us find out what Mr. Browder's interpretation of it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Read it to Mr. Browder again.

Mr. MATTHEWS (reading):

What is the nature of membership in the Communist Party? This is well stated in the constitution and rules of the Communist International, paragraph

3, which reads as follows: "Membership in the Communist Party and in the Communist International is open to all those who accept the program and rules of the given Communist Party and of the Communist International, who join one of the basic units of a party, actively work in it, abide by all decisions of the party and of the Communist International, and regularly pay party dues."

That is the end of the quotation from the constitution. Continuing the words of Mr. Bittelman:

You will observe that all of the specific requirements for membership in the party aim at one thing, namely, the active, conscious and disciplined participation in the struggles of the masses that are led and organized by the Party.

Do you wish Mr. Browder to give his interpretation of that?

Mr. BROWDER. I would be very glad to.

The CHAIRMAN. It means what it says. It is very plain.

Mr. BROWDER. But it does not mean what Mr. Matthews in his question inferred it means.

The CHAIRMAN. What does it mean?

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Matthews inferred that independently of the decisions of the Communist Party of the United States, the individual members of the party would be bound by the decisions of the Communist International. The fact of the matter is that the Communist Party of the United States acts, not through its individual members in such questions, but through its own bodies elected in the United States, the leadership of the Communist Party of the United States. This is provided in the constitution of the Communist Party, where it is made very clear that the supreme body for decisions of the Communist Party of the United States is the convention of the party.

The CHAIRMAN. Then that statement by Mr. Bittelman was incorrect?

Mr. BROWDER. As interpreted by Mr. Matthews.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you interpret it?

Mr. THOMAS. How do you interpret it?

Mr. BROWDER. I interpret it by the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. What does the sentence mean when it refers to the rules of the given Communist Party and the Communist International? To me it means that the members of the Communist Party here are governed by the rules of the given Communist Party and the Communist International. Does it not mean the same to you?

Mr. BROWDER. That—

Mr. THOMAS. Answer it "yes" or "no"; does it not mean the same to you?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not mean exactly the same to me as it does to you.

The CHAIRMAN. What does it mean to you, when they use the words "Communist Party" and the "Communist International"? What does that mean to you?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not understand your question. Make it more specific.

The CHAIRMAN. Read it over again. Let us see if you can interpret this in any other way except the plain purport of the writing.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, there is another quotation, also from the constitution of the Communist International, on page 35 of this pamphlet, which raises the same question and is just as clear, I think, for the purposes which we have in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Bittelman says:

An essential part of the Bolshevik principles of organization is the principle of democratic centralism. The constitution and rules of the Communist International formulate this as follows:

"The Communist International and its sections are built upon the basis of democratic centralism, the fundamental principles of which are: (a) Election of all the leading committees in the party, subordinate and superior (by general meetings of party members, conferences, congresses, and international congresses); (b) periodical reports by leading party committees to their constituents; (c) decisions of superior party committees to be obligatory for subordinate committees, strict party discipline and prompt execution of the decisions of the Communist International, of its leading committees and of the leading party centers.

"Party questions may be discussed by the members of the party and by the party organizations until such time as a decision is taken upon them by the competent party committees. After a decision has been taken by the congress of the Communist International, by the congress of the respective sections, or by leading committees of the Comintern, and of its various sections, these decisions must be unreservedly carried out even if a section of the party membership or of the local party organization are in disagreement with it.

"In cases where the party exists illegally the superior party committees may appoint the subordinate committees and co-opt members on their own committees subject to subsequent endorsement by the competent superior party committees."

That language, I believe you will notice, is somewhat stronger than the language of the other paragraph in that the decisions of the congress of the Communist International must be unreservedly carried out even if lower party bodies are in disagreement with them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say it is correct in the sense that any party that disagreed with the decisions of a congress and did not carry them out would withdraw from the Communist International. Only those would stay in the Communist International who agreed. The Communist International is a body, an association of people of like minds, and if their minds differ on fundamental questions, they would part company.

The CHAIRMAN. Then that is a correct statement, that Mr. Matthews read?

Mr. BROWDER. In general principle.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, the decisions of the Communist International are obligatory upon all sections and affiliates of the Communist International and if they disagree they have only the choice of retiring from the Communist International; is that correct, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. That is, they are obligatory for the continuation of the association.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what he asked you.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the answer to his question is "Yes."

Mr. BROWDER. He was inferring—

The CHAIRMAN. He was not inferring anything.

Mr. BROWDER. An authoritarian imposition of decision. It is a question of the conditions for the continuation of the association.

The CHAIRMAN. It is just a question like this: If they issue an order and you do not obey it, you have got to get out.

Mr. BROWDER. I have never heard of any orders being issued.

The CHAIRMAN. If they did issue an order and you disobeyed it, you would have to get out.

Mr. BROWDER. Of course, if anybody gives me an order and I disobey it, I am breaking relations with him.

Mr. STARNES. Let us quit the shadow boxing and get an answer to this question. Does the international party have any authority over its affiliates or associated bodies?

Mr. BROWDER. It has.

Mr. STARNES. Is there an international authority in communism?

Mr. BROWDER. Of course. It has the moral—

Mr. STARNES. Over whom?

Mr. BROWDER. It has moral and political authority arising from acceptance of its teachings.

Mr. CASEY. Before you go on, I take it, Mr. Browder, there is no question but what the Communist Party of America is within the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party is affiliated with the Communist International.

Mr. VOORHIS. And further that in order for it to continue that affiliation, it is true, is it not, it has to abide with its decision?

Mr. BROWDER. It is necessary for it to agree with the decisions of the International. I would emphasize the nature of this affiliation as an agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Reading from the same pamphlet, the same chapter, on page 46:

Our party is the United States section of the Communist International, which is a world Communist Party, and each one of us is therefore a member of a world party.

And continuing further down the same page:

The World Congress elects the executive committee of the Communist International and the international control commission. The decisions of the executive committee of the Communist International are obligatory for all the sections of the Communist International and must be promptly carried out.

That is the language of Mr. Bittelman, Mr. Chairman, and not a quotation from the constitution of the Communist International.

Has Mr. Bittelman correctly stated the facts?

Mr. BROWDER. Not fully, because he left out one of the very essential roles that is played by the party as a national party and a relation of the party to that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. With the exception of leaving that out, the rest of the statement is true?

Mr. BROWDER. If understood in that light, of the role of the party to the Nation as developed in the constitution, modified that way, it would then be correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, who called the first session of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When was that first congress of the Communist International held?

Mr. BROWDER. In March 1919.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are acquainted with the pamphlet entitled "Foundation of the Communist International," by V. I. Lenin?

Mr. BROWDER. I am.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In this pamphlet, on page 27, we find the following statement:

And the most characteristic feature of this International, its mission, is to fulfill and bring to life and heritage of Marxism and to realize the century-old ideas of socialism and the labor movement—this most characteristic feature of the Third International showed itself at once in the fact that the new, third International Working Men's Association has already begun now to coincide to a certain degree, with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Do you agree with the statement made by Lenin?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I think it is very clear that the Union Soviet of the Socialist Republic is realizing the teachings of Marxism which were embodied in the Communist—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). I refer specifically to the statement that the Third International, the Comintern, has already begun now to coincide to a certain degree with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; the principle of the Third International being realized in the Soviet Union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Lenin did not state that the principles coincided but that the Third International had begun to coincide.

Mr. BROWDER. That is the clear meaning; he is dealing with the principles; he is dealing with the principles of Marxism and the principles of the Communist International.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, has the American Communist Party, through its leaders and publications, made frequent references to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a model party for all other Communist Parties?

Mr. BROWDER. Frequently.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the world?

Mr. BROWDER. Frequently.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There has been recently published in the United States a history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the edition a rather large one?

Mr. BROWDER. One hundred thousand copies.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is the party of the United States now conducting a campaign for the education of its own members in all the history and tactics of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are the members of the Communist Party of the United States required to purchase copies of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. Not required to; it is purely a voluntary act.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Not required except by moral stress of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. Required, insofar as they accept the opinions of the leaders of the party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. They have been urged so to do?

Mr. BROWDER. They have been urged to do so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Rather strongly?

Mr. BROWDER. Very strongly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Reading from the Communist for September 1939 from an article which is signed only with the initials A. B., which I take to refer to Alex Bittleman—

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. We have the following statement:

Communists, and many non-Communists, are well familiar with the fact that, beginning with about 1924, when the post-war revolutionary wave was beginning temporarily to recede, all Communist Parties, upon Stalin's advice, began concentrating on bolshevizing themselves. And this was the main content of the guidance of the Communist International.

The Communist Party has frequently referred to the guidance of the Communist International—

Mr. BROWDER. Frequently.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In its affairs, and has frequently made reference to Stalin's advice in conducting its activities?

Mr. BROWDER. Frequently.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Again from the same editorial I read with reference to the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which we have just been discussing, the following statement:

Hence a comparative study of the history of the two parties has become an absolute necessity for every Communist, for every anti-Fascist, for every progressive fighter of America. The history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the guide to the struggle for democracy.

That is an indication that the party members are expected, rather emphatically, to purchase and study that history.

Mr. BROWDER. That is, they are advised that they will be unable to follow the events of the day if they do not know the history.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To understand and study the history in the United States—

Mr. BROWDER. In the world.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Including the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Including the United States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That it is absolutely necessary for them to study the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and use it as their guide?

Mr. BROWDER. That it is necessary to the understanding of the movement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In this country and in the struggle for democracy?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the same issue of the Communist you have an article entitled "Some Remarks on the Twentieth Anniversary of the Communist Party of the United States."

Mr. BROWDER. I have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I read the following statement, also concerning the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

In approaching the task of working out detailed and systematic understanding of the history of the United States of America, of the labor movement, and of the Socialist movement and specifically the Communist Party of the United States of America we have received a highly important stimulus and help in a recently published History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

That is a further verification of your estimate of the history of the Communist Party as being absolutely necessary.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For the American party?

Mr. BROWDER. As I suggest, it emphasizes and expresses the good of this book, as I understand it.

Mr. CASEY. You say it expresses and emphasizes the good of this book as you understand it?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. I have made a speech devoted entirely to this book; if you gentlemen are interested I would be glad to give you a copy of it.

Mr. CASEY. Quite aside from that then unless the reader of this book has your interpretation and understanding of it he would be free to understand it according to his own limitations and ability?

Mr. BROWDER. Each reader would have to understand it according to his own ability and understanding. I have done my best to help in the full understanding of it. I made one speech devoted entirely to this question and if you gentlemen are interested I would be glad to furnish you with a copy. It was delivered at the fifteenth anniversary of the Workers School. It is devoted very largely to the significance of this history as a distribution of the theory.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say then, Mr. Browder, that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has played a great role in the development of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In corroboration of that answer, I read the following from an article in the Communist:

In making available the lessons of the broadest international experiences in the first place, the tremendous achievement of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which is successfully building the new socialist society which is embracing 170,000,000 population, one-sixth of the earth's surface, the Communist International has played and continues to play a great role in the development of the Communist Party of the United States.

That is a statement which you subscribed to, I take it?

Mr. BROWDER. That is better understood if you will continue with the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. MATTHEWS. With the work—

Mr. BROWDER. I would suggest that will be clarified if you will read the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Put the balance of it in the record; I think it is only fair to read the balance.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. [Reading:]

It is precisely this education in internationalism which has enabled the Communist Party of the United States of America to become organically American, rooted in the American soil and tradition, and understanding American problems and history in a deeper sense than they have been probed before. Both Lenin and Stalin, besides the contribution to the American workers made by their leadership of the Soviet Union, have by direct expression of opinion contributed inestimably to the mastering of American problems. Of this contribution I have written in more detail previously.

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is correct that both Lenin and Stalin have made direct expressions of opinions which have been necessary for the mastery of American problems by the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, you are acquainted with the publication Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. I am.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you a photostatic copy of an article from the Communist International dated October 15, 1933. Do you recognize that from the photostat copy [exhibiting to witness]?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this be marked for identification.

The CHAIRMAN. Has he identified it?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

(The article referred to was marked "Exhibit No. —.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. The article begins on page 726 of the Communist International, and is entitled "Review of the Daily Worker, U. S. A. (June and July)."

The subtitle in the paragraph reads as follows:

In the order of checking up the carrying out of the tasks put before the Communist Party of the United States of America by the executive committee of the Communist International.

The article is a very lengthy one, and it would be impossible to read it, but I will summarize its purpose and ask you if that summary is correct.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Communist International examined and analyzed 2 months' issues of the Daily Worker and then wrote a rather lengthy report on the successes and shortcomings of the Daily Worker for the guidance of its publishers in the future.

Mr. BROWDER. Very sharply criticized it and pointed out wherein it has made many political mistakes; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And did it make constructive suggestions as to the future?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; it made some very serious observations about how certain weaknesses had prevented the party from effectively meeting the problems and how they could be overcome.

The CHAIRMAN. And in furtherance of those suggestions has the Daily Worker taken the advice given in those suggestions?

Mr. BROWDER. I think they learned a great deal from them; that is correct.

Mr. STARNES. Did they take advantage of the suggestions?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Did they carry out the suggestions which were made?

Mr. BROWDER. As a precondition to taking advantage of this learning.

Mr. STARNES. Then they followed the suggestions?

Mr. BROWDER. As we learned them.

Mr. STARNES. As you learned them and you interpreted them?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And understood them?

Mr. BROWDER. Some things we did not learn and did not do, and others we did.

Mr. CASEY. One more suggestion: Can you give us an idea as to what the suggestions were, or are they too lengthy?

Mr. MATTHEWS. They are rather lengthy.

Mr. CASEY. Can you put them in the record?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think perhaps the conclusion might be put into the record as an elucidation of that particular matter.

Mr. CASEY. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Conclusion appears on pages 737, 738, and 739.  
(The statement referred to is as follows:)

#### CONCLUSIONS

The review of the Daily Worker for June-July shows a certain improvement in the paper toward the end of this period. This improvement consists in the paper's giving more topical material, and presenting it in a more popular form to the working-class readers. However, together with this, the paper (a) has not succeeded in carrying on campaigns on questions of the greatest importance to the party, particularly on the popularization of the Open Letter, on the economic struggles, and on the trade-union question; (b) has, although supplying better and more topical, informational, and party, also propagandist material, still been very weak as agitator and organizer; (c) does not show a sufficiently careful and politically worked out plan for carrying through the campaigns of the party; (d) has had very weak connections with the local organizations, particularly the party organizations. In view of this it is necessary to take a number of practical measures to strengthen the cadres of the workers, both centrally and locally; to secure assistance and control by the political bureau of the party, to strengthen the participation of the local party organizations in the work of the paper, in order further to improve the contents of the paper and increase its role as a class agitator and organizer of the work of the party in the masses, and as builder of the party. It is necessary to carry out in practice the decision on the work of the Daily Workers' representatives in the districts chosen as points of concentration, on the regular pages to be directed to work in each such district.

The principal task of the paper at the present time is the struggle against Roosevelt's policy, the popularization of the Open Letter, and the fight for carrying it into life.

At the monthly discussion of the work of the paper by the central committee it is necessary each time not only to summarize the work of the paper in the most important campaigns and give instructions based on it, but also to discuss how the paper fought for carrying out the principal tasks of the party, e. g., the building of the party in districts for concentration; the development of revolutionary trade-union work, particularly the opposition inside the American Federation of Labor in the branches of industry where it has mass organizations; leadership of strikes, popularization of the experience and lessons of strikes; the daily popularization and organization of the united front from below in mass work and mass action—the fight against social fascism on both fundamental questions (democracy and dictatorship, fascism, way out of the crisis, state capitalism, danger of war, unity of the working class, etc.), and on daily questions of mass action—the attack of capital, etc.; the fight against the danger of war and in defense of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, point which as yet is very insufficiently stressed in the paper.

(b) The Daily Worker must decidedly strengthen the struggle for developing revolutionary trade-union work, in the first place by systematically popularizing the tasks of the party in this work, particularly in the building up of revolutionary trade-unions and the creation of independent unions in the steel and automobile industries, in the organization of mass opposition in the American Federation of Labor by showing the experience of this work, regularly printing pages on work in the most important branches of industry; to carry this out the paper must have permanent connections with the active party members in the trade-unions; secondly, by specially explaining to the nonparty workers, in the most popular manner possible, the current tasks of trade-union work, with concrete examples (e. g., the Gary strike against a company union, the miners' strike against the will of the American Federation of Labor leaders, etc.), with workers' letters, at conferences with worker readers of the paper, etc., so that not the least detail of trade-union life, of the trade-union policy, and work of the party should remain unexplained to the nonparty masses; and particularly questions of opposition work in the American Federation of Labor (mobilization of the membership masses against the American Federation of Labor leaders, who are supporting Roosevelt, for strikes, against the persuasion of the American Federation of Labor as in Pennsylvania), work in the independent unions, questions of trade-union unity, attitude toward the Musteites, the policy of the reformist trade-unions, etc., for it is necessary to

extend the network of nonparty local worker correspondents, in the local organizations of the trade-unions, carrying on systematic work among them. Questions of trade-union work should occupy a central place in the paper; for that reason this work must undoubtedly be carried on by a comrade with a profound understanding, who has had serious experience of trade-union work, with a good understanding of the policy and task of the party in this question, and of the work of the American Federation of Labor.

(c) In spite of the great growth in the strike struggle, particularly after the passing of Roosevelt's laws, the popularization of the experience and lessons of these strikes (strikes of metal workers and miners for higher wages, recognition of unions, etc., the role of the American Federation of Labor, and of the revolutionary elements in these strikes) have not occupied a corresponding central position in the paper, in connection with and together with the daily trade-union work. The paper must not only increase the quantity of information on strikes, which has up to now been quite insufficient, but must systematically explain, giving concrete examples (strikes in Detroit, Buffalo, etc.), the aims of the strike struggle and the problems of its tactics, so that the working class reader should receive not only information about strikes, but also explanations of the mistakes or shortcomings in the organization of a particular strike; this is necessary in order that the strike may be more successfully carried on, etc.; systematically to print editorials summarizing the experience of strikes, etc., constantly leading the workers toward an understanding of the necessity for their own leadership of strikes on the basis of the united front.

(d) The Daily Worker has printed several articles dealing with questions of the united front. However, these articles explain the policy of the party only to the active party members, and not sufficiently either. It is necessary to extend the popularization of the practice of the united front in the districts, particularly taking into consideration the level of the understanding of the rank-and-file nonparty worker, showing good and bad examples of the united front. Besides this, it is necessary to give a number of popular articles on the united front, making use of concrete examples of strikes, hunger marches (the metal workers' strike in Buffalo, and the hunger march to Ford's in Detroit) to explain such questions, for example, as what the united front is, why it is necessary from below, and not from above, the Communists' attitude toward rank-and-file workers in the American Federation of Labor and the Socialist Party, and toward their leaders; why the Communists consider these leaders traitors, splitters, social-fascists, etc., and the attitude of the social-fascist leaders toward the united front as a maneuver.

(e) The Daily Worker has considerably strengthened the struggle against social-fascism along the lines of exposing the policy of the social-fascists on current events. While continuing to carry on this most important work in the same spirit, it is necessary, in the first place, to expand the information and criticism of the practical work of the Socialist Party in the local strikes (e. g., the textile industry), demonstrations, in the factories, the unions, in the municipalities, e. g. (Milwaukee) and so on, and, secondly, to begin to carry on extensive criticism of and polemics against the social-fascists, making use of definite points (i. e., the attitude toward Roosevelt's laws, etc.), in the principal questions of program which divide the Communists from the social-reformists (democracy and dictatorship, fascism, the capitalist and the revolutionary way out of the crisis, state capitalism, the danger of war, the unity of the working class, etc.).

(f) The Daily Worker carries on a campaign of some magnitude against Roosevelt's forced labor camps. This work must be intensified, by printing not only information, as has been done up to now, but also a number of political articles on the questions and methods of struggle in these camps. The paper has dropped its work among the unemployed—very little material is printed on this subject, and the campaign for social insurance which was renewed in June has again subsided. It is necessary to carry out systematically the decision on the campaign for social insurance, the importance of which has not decreased through the adoption of Roosevelt's laws, but has, on the contrary, increased, particularly in view of the coming fifth hungry winter of the crisis. The same applies to the work of the unemployed councils.

(g) The paper's network of worker-correspondents is still very weak, and no serious work among them is evident. The paper must very soon take steps, first and foremost, to create a strong network of worker-correspondents in the localities, in order to instruct and help them in writing their letters and to raise their political level; not only to print letters, but to point out the political

importance and the lessons of any given fact described by the correspondent, instructing him on his work and the paper's systematically discussing the work of particular correspondents or groups of correspondents over a certain period (e. g., a month), in order to reveal a correspondent's main shortcomings and achievements and to help him in his further work.

It is necessary to enliven the work of the workers' editorial councils in the center and the concentration districts, to develop the initiative of the members, carrying out their proposals, arranging regular (e. g., weekly) discussions of Daily Workers' questions with them, in which leading comrades should take part, thus drawing them into the daily work of the paper.

(h) The work carried on by the paper to popularize the Open Letter and carry out its instructions is very weak. And yet, the popularization of the Open Letter and the fight for realizing it have now become still more important in connection with the mobilization of the party against Roosevelt's measures. It is necessary systematically to print articles explaining various points of the letter in connection with the situation and current events of the class struggle in the country, to give information on discussion of the Open Letter in the localities, and, first and foremost, to organize a checking up on the carrying out of the Open Letter with regard to the tasks set in concentration. The paper must combine its foremost task—the fight against Roosevelt's measures—with popularization of the Open Letter and fight for it, in concrete questions (concentration, trade-unions, united front, strikes, etc.).

(i) The Daily Worker does not deal with questions of building the party. And yet these questions are of a decisive importance for the development of the Communist Party of the United States of America, its transformation into a mass party, its bolshevisation. The paper must create a section of party life and party construction, which would, however, in its work take into consideration all the conditions necessary for conspiracy, which are secured directly by the Central Committee of the party. In this section the paper must, in the first place explain the line of the party in the most important current questions and fight for this line; secondly, it must fight for a check-up on the execution of the party's decisions, of the tasks set by it, showing how this execution is going on, explaining the tasks of the party with concrete examples, and showing how to carry them out, and so forth; thirdly, it must particularly give information on the tasks and methods of mass work of the Communists, in mass organizations, particularly the trade unions; fourthly, it must popularize the experience of the organizational building of the party, the work of the cells, the fight against bureaucracy, for discipline, against membership fluctuation; recruiting work, work among new members, and so forth; fifthly, it must give information on questions of propagandist work, on the work of the school, on questions of agitation, on the work of factory papers.

(j) In the work of the paper not enough planning and care is evident. Although the paper's leading articles have become shorter and more popular, they often resemble an editorial or just incidental paragraph, which is not connected with the rest of the paper's contents. It is necessary to make the leading articles politically instructive and supported by the main concrete material printed in the paper. This requires better organization of all the material, the addition to sections and important letters of editorial notes, a better and clearer grouping, and so forth, in order that each issue should have a definite task, around which the material should be organized, and that each issue should therefore bring a definite point or task home to the worker, to inform him on them concretely and from all angles.

Therefore the paper must work according to a plan, the leading articles must be carefully thought out, the most important leading articles must be discussed beforehand by the Central Committee, together with members of the editorial board; and, generally the leading articles must be agreed upon by the Central Committee, so that the party should really regard the paper's editorials as leading political articles.

In all its work the paper must remember that all information must serve for educating and organizing the masses and the party itself; for that reason it cannot limit itself to giving information, but must carry on, on the basis of information, explanatory work, a fight for the line of the party; must agitate for the party's slogans, organize the workers, pointing out what the workers should do and how they should do it in their struggle, in work in the trade-unions, and so forth, bringing the workers to an understanding of the main

questions of the Communist Party's tactics and the main tasks in the fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The recommendations made by the Communist International to the Daily Worker include the sharpening of its attack upon the New Deal, among other things. Is that correct, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not sure about that. I do not recall that particular item, but I do know that just during that period there was a sharp difference of opinion developing in the relation to the New Deal. Up until December 1934—about December 1934—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). That is a correct statement?

Mr. BROWDER. Up until the end of 1934 the Communists were the sharpest critics, and most of the time, until 1933 and 1934, the only public critics of the New Deal.

The CHAIRMAN. And then it is a fact?

Mr. BROWDER. And at the end of 1934 and the beginning of 1935 it began to reexamine the attitude and fundamentals, and at the same time another group of Americans began to reexamine it, and the result of this examination was that about the same time the Liberty League was formed, at about that time the Communist Party revised its attacks and began to support specific phases of the New Deal.

Mr. STARNES. You reacted like the Trotskyites reacted to Stalin?

Mr. BROWDER. No; our reaction to the New Deal was in the opposite way to what the Liberty League did.

Mr. STARNES. Just as the Trotskyites reacted to the Stalin program?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not think the analogy is entirely accurate.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe that the Trotskyites are all bad?

Mr. BROWDER. They are all bad.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, nothing anybody can say for them.

Mr. BROWDER. You can list all the cuss words together in describing them.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, let us proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, are you familiar with a publication entitled "Deutscher Weckrufund Beobachter," the publication of the German-American Bund in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. I have not seen it; I have heard of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. If the Ausland Institute at Stuttgart, in Germany, should take 60 copies of the Deutscher Weckrufund Beobachter and analyze them with the most careful scrutiny and then publish a 30- or 40-page statement recommending alterations here and there in that paper in the United States, would you not say that the Ausland Institute in Germany was exercising rather direct and complete control over the publication?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not think that would be evidence, in my judgment, about the Nazi group in the United States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; but I asked you if that would not be a conclusion that could be logically drawn?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not draw a bad conclusion from that; I would draw my conclusion from the policies of the paper.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The fact that the publication of the German-American Bund was guided by an agency in Germany would not lead you to the conclusion that the publication did not have complete autonomy?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I would draw my conclusion on the basis of policy contained in the paper.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it not perfectly clear that the Daily Worker does not have an independent existence, free to publish what it thinks should be published and to omit what it thinks should not be published.

Mr. BROWDER. It is not clear. The Daily Worker is completely free to develop and conduct the paper in any way in which the editorial staff in America desires is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I call your attention to the fact or the statement under the heading of this article which includes the word "the tasks put before the Communist Party of the United States of America by executive committee of the Communist International."

I think you have already made it plain that when such tasks are put before the party the party has its choice either to comply or retire from the Communist International.

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that if it disagrees with the tasks; yes. We would retire at any time we are given a task by anybody, if we disagreed, because it can only give advice and we would have the choice.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If the Daily Worker failed or refused to comply with the criticisms set forth in this analysis, the party would be in trouble with the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. Or the Comintern would be in trouble with the party. In other words there would be a difference of opinion between them.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, someone in the International organization gives the orders, lays down the policies, and it is not a question of obeying; it is a question for them to agree.

Mr. BROWDER. If they do not agree, there would be a difference of opinion.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, you do not use the word "obey"; you use the word "agree," and whenever an order is issued there is not such a thing as obeying, you simply agree, as a matter of policy, and go along?

Mr. BROWDER. No orders are issued, and therefore there is no question of obeying.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does not the Comintern—

Mr. BROWDER. If you will pardon me for just one further word in order to make it quite clear, and I think you are all interested in being clear about it.

Mr. STARNES. To make the comparison, Mr. Browder, in this country a law is enacted.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. By the National Government.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. The people do not obey they just agree?

Mr. BROWDER. No; that is not it.

Mr. STARNES. That would be a parallel, would it not?

Mr. BROWDER. I thank you very much for giving me that illustration.

Mr. STARNES. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. BROWDER. It will help me to make perfectly clear what I am trying to say in trying to compare the advice given to us from the Communist International with a law passed in the United States. This is the point that I want to clarify, that no parallel can be drawn whatsoever.

A law has to be obeyed and nobody can have any exception to it, and there is no voluntary relationship existing between the citizen and the law; the citizen cannot retire from the force of the law.

The policy relationship existing between the party and the Comintern is entirely voluntary. There is no authoritativeness about it at all; it is not in the nature of a law.

The CHAIRMAN. Just an agreement of the party to comply with the suggestions?

Mr. BROWDER. There is an agreement on principles.

The CHAIRMAN. If you accept them you agree and if you do not you disagree.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You have no such thing as law in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. There is a constitution and bylaws; it is a voluntary association; none of these are laws; they can be terminated at any time.

Mr. STARNES. No decrees are ever written under those laws?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Or any such thing as a decree?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Any proclamations?

Mr. BROWDER. Proclamations; yes; are used, and statements of policies.

Mr. STARNES. Statements of policies; they have no force and effect: the people just agree or disagree?

Mr. BROWDER. They have force and effect when they are enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, gentlemen; let us proceed.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask one word before we go on.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. It is true, is it not, that from the Comintern you get policies for the Communist Party of America?

Mr. BROWDER. It is true that the Comintern has periodically conferred with representatives of the various parties who meet together to discuss the aims as agreements of the most complicated problems in international affairs, and from these discussions come the so-called decisions of the Communist International.

Mr. CASEY. That is, the Comintern is the source of all these policies and ideas as well as communistic principles?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes: I would prefer to say it is the movement whereby these things are discussed.

Mr. STARNES. And it is the one source that makes them effective?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. There is no such thing as an army or navy or police power or anything like that at all?

Mr. BROWDER. Absolutely not.

Mr. STARNES. To be used in carrying out the policies and programs and manifestoes or agreements?

Mr. BROWDER. Absolutely not, insofar as the body is concerned. You are referring to government now.

Mr. STARNES. What is the purpose of an army and a navy and a police force in a communistic country then?

Mr. BROWDER. You are talking now about the State, the Nation, the Government, which were here long before we were.

The CHAIRMAN. No international organization can impose or pass a law for the United States.

Mr. BROWDER. Of course not.

The CHAIRMAN. Whether it is the Nazi, the Communist, or the Fascist.

Mr. BROWDER. Of course not.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, what you really mean in discussing the Communist Party is that it cannot, as an international organization, nor as a Comintern impose any law on anybody in the United States, but from South America and from every other country there is a Communist Party. The Communist Party is allowed to have a representative on the Comintern. I am talking about the real Communist Party.

Mr. BROWDER. Of real Communists.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us proceed.

Mr. VOORHIS. That was the point that Mr. Browder made a while ago, that in effect you could not actually be a party to the Communist Party unless you did agree with the principles of the Comintern and practices outlined there.

Mr. BROWDER. The very principle and policy of keeping together like-minded people. When people do not have minds thinking along the same line they do not stay together long.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, to continue what I was asking you, the Communist Party sends its delegates to meetings in Moscow and they consider various matters of policy, tactics, and agreements to be followed by the Communist Party, and when they enter into those agreements they become the decisions of the Communist Party; is that the fact?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And those decisions are obligatory, in the sense that while they do not have the force of law they have the force of moral and policy persuasion, also with the penalty that if they do not agree they get out of the organization.

Mr. BROWDER. That is the force, that is the condition under which they associate.

The CHAIRMAN. And if they do not agree—

Mr. BROWDER. If they do not agree—

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). They get out. And there is no way that an international organization could make it any stronger.

Mr. BROWDER. I do not see how it could.

Mr. STARNES. Let us see how the international plan works. You get a direct law that is applicable to parties in the specific country where they live.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Now as to policy, they are carried out by agreement—

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. You have laws in particular countries; is that the idea; you have laws?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, no.

Mr. STARNES. No such thing as laws? I am not talking about the international; I am talking about the Soviet Union. We will say that the Soviet Union is composed of the Communist party. Now would not the Communist Party of the United States of America have laws?

Mr. BROWDER. Not as a party, but the government would have laws. Certainly, we believe in government of law.

Mr. STARNES. You believe in a government of law?

Mr. BROWDER. Absolutely.

Mr. STARNES. And manifestoes?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party is an eternal foe of anarchy.

Mr. STARNES. You believe in the issuance of manifestoes and in government by manifestoes?

Mr. BROWDER. We believe in the orderly process of government.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The question of the control of the Communist Party of the United States over its own members has been raised, and perhaps we might just as well at this time produce a document entitled "The Central Control Commission, Communist Party of the United States of America, New York, N. Y." You do have in the Communist Party, Mr. Browder, a Central Control Commission?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recognize this photostatic copy of a document of that commission [handing to witness]?

Mr. BROWDER (after examining). I had not seen this before. I assume it is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That appears to be the form in which such documents are customarily published?

Mr. BROWDER. I assume this is a correct copy. I had not seen this particular document.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you do know such documents are published by the party from time to time?

Mr. BROWDER. They have been in the past.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. There has been very little occasion for it for some time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have this marked for identification as an exhibit in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

(The paper above referred to was marked "September 6, 1939.  
Witness Browder. W. R. G.")

Mr. MATTHEWS. This document is dated May 1935. It contains a list of those who were expelled from the Communist Party of the United States in the year 1934. The name of the person expelled, his party connection, and the reason for his expulsion is set forth in each instance.

In clearing up the question of why members are expelled from the Communist Party, which was raised yesterday, these illustrations, or some of them, may throw light on the subject.

I notice that a number of persons were expelled, according to the document, from the Communist Party because of their cooperation with the Democratic Party. Do you recall, Mr. Browder, that there were persons expelled from the party at this time for that reason?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And in at least one instance a party member was expelled for supporting a Republican candidate?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In another instance a member was expelled for putting religion above the party. Do you recall a case of that kind, or other cases of that kind, in the history of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't recall that; no.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the detail—he was expelled because he put his religion above the party?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The exact language is "For putting religion above the party." That was the ground noted for expulsion here in this document.

Mr. CASEY. Who issued that document?

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of the United States of America, which is the commission, as I understand it, which has final authority in such matters. Is that correct, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. It reviews all the disciplinary questions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. They have final authority?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And, Mr. Matthews, did you notice any illustrations where a person was expelled for putting his country before his party?

Mr. BROWDER. No; you cannot find that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not know of any such instance as that in this particular document. There will be evidence bearing on that question later, Mr. Thomas.

I call your attention, Mr. Browder, to several cases in which members were expelled from the party for misconduct in one or another of the so-called mass organizations. One man was expelled from the Communist Party because he took \$5 from the I. L. D. Would misconduct of that sort in the International Labor Defense constitute a ground for expulsion from the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. It certainly would—or in any other organization.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, you want to qualify the statement which you made yesterday, I believe, that only political considerations were ever taken into account in connection with the severing of a man's relationship with the party?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that that is the most serious political consideration; proper conduct of Communists in mass organizations is the very life of our party and any member of our party who goes beyond—who breaks the rules and does not carry through the decisions of the organizations to which he belongs, injures the party most drastically and, therefore, he has to get out of the party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I presume the way that the Communist Party would know about this crime, as you describe it, would be that the

International Labor Defense would notify the party of the conduct of the member?

Mr. BROWDER. No. We have no relations with mass organizations that they notify us.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, how would the Communist Party know that a certain member had taken \$5 from the International Labor Defense?

Mr. BROWDER. Other members inform the party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Other members in the International Labor Defense, necessarily?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then whether it came officially from the headquarters of the International Labor Defense, or from a member, or members, of the International Labor Defense, would you consider that material?

Mr. BROWDER. We rely upon our members to keep us informed upon those things.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I notice, also, that one member was expelled because he was found to be a "petty intellectual."

The CHAIRMAN. A what?

Mr. MATTHEWS. A petty intellectual—p-e-t-t-y i-n-t-e-l-l-e-c-t-u-a-l. Is that still a ground for expulsion from the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't understand that at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the notation given here beside the name of the man who was expelled. I wondered if that was also a political crime which would be a ground for expulsion.

Mr. BROWDER. I never heard of the expression before.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In numerous instances we have a notation that the expelled member "refused to carry out party decisions." That is in line with your explanation of the relationship between the Communist Party of the United States and the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. Exactly.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A member must carry out all decisions of the party or be expelled from the party?

The CHAIRMAN. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. STARNES. A party member does not have any latitude or discretion in the matter—he has to carry out orders or get out?

Mr. BROWDER. The party has to carry out orders.

Mr. STARNES. I do not know what terms are used—

Mr. BROWDER. I am afraid you are trying to create a picture of the party as a sort of army with captains and lieutenants and corporals and sergeants, and everybody receiving orders, but there is no such thing. And if we tried to make such a thing, we would not be building a political party as we are.

Mr. STARNES. I have no such inference; that is an inference you are drawing yourself. What I am trying to find out is how in the world you do operate.

Mr. BROWDER. I would be glad to explain it, but I am answering questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed; we will get to that later.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I also notice, Mr. Browder, several members were expelled for misconduct, usually of a financial nature, in the International Workers' Order. Do you recall such expulsions?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not; no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But such misconduct in the International Workers' Order would also be a ground for expulsion from the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. It certainly would.

Mr. STARNES. Is that a political consideration?

Mr. BROWDER. A political consideration.

Mr. MATTHEWS. We have here the case of a man who was expelled from the Communist Party for slanders against the Soviet Union. That is a ground for expulsion from the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. It certainly is.

Mr. THOMAS. What was that last question?

Mr. STARNES. A man cannot express himself—

The CHAIRMAN. Just one at a time. Who had the first question?

Mr. STARNES. What I want to know is, a man cannot express himself freely about the party and its policies?

Mr. BROWDER. Certainly; certainly he can.

Mr. STARNES. He can do it, but he cannot do it and stay in the party?

Mr. BROWDER. If his views differ from the party's, that means by expressing himself, he is separating himself from the party.

Mr. STARNES. I see.

Mr. CASEY. As I understand, that was an expression of criticism of the Soviet Union?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. That is not the Communist Party, as I understand; that was the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. Slanders against the Soviet Union, the land where the political theories of the Communists are being carried out. That is an attack against the principles of our party.

Mr. CASEY. What would you say if a member of the Communist Party of America took issue with Stalin's nonaggression pact with Germany; would that constitute a slander of the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. I think it would be a demonstration of a most serious lack of understanding of polities, and a serious disregard of the national interests of America which have been helped by that pact.

Mr. CASEY. All right.

Mr. STARNES. Therefore, he should be expelled from the party?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, we would try to clear him up first. If he persisted in his opinion, that would be a sharp break from the party.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be a ground for expulsion?

Mr. BROWDER. Of course.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have one question. The document Mr. Matthews is reading there is a list of expulsions by a certain authoritative group of the Communist Party, is it?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right; the Central Control Commission.

Mr. MASON. Now, the witness states each time, practically, that when a Communist differs or disagrees or criticizes, or does something, he automatically withdraws from the Communist Party, or separates himself. Now, this is not an automatic separation; this is a decision by a group.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think he made that clear, that a member can voluntarily quit; then, if he does not do it, the party acts by expelling him; is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right. The party, by his expulsion, is registering the fact that that person, by his activities or opinions, has politically separated himself, and this decision is accompanied by an organizational registration of the political fact.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you have just as much discipline as you could possibly have under any circumstances? You could not have any more discipline, could you, if you had every man under Government discipline?

Mr. BROWDER. Discipline as to procedure as practiced by every organization.

The CHAIRMAN. What other discipline could you have that would be more if you had a governmental party?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, there are organizations which attempt to go beyond that. The Communist Party never does.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean there are organizations that go beyond your disciplinary measures?

Mr. BROWDER. I have heard of such things.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

Mr. BROWDER. I have heard of such things.

The CHAIRMAN. But that is just rumor.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I understood you, Mr. Browder, to say that if a Communist in the United States, a member of the communistic group in this country, would take it upon himself to criticize the Soviet Union, he would be expelled from your organization?

Mr. BROWDER. No. I said if he "slandered the Soviet Union."

Mr. DEMPSEY. If he slandered the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. If he took issue with fundamental principles which are being applied there.

Mr. DEMPSEY. By the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But what would happen should he take it upon himself to criticize the United States Government?

Mr. BROWDER. If he criticized the United States Government in the same way, he would also be separating himself from the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Do you have any members left in the Communist Party now?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, we have approximately 100,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You are not checking up very closely, are you, on what they say about our present Government?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You are?

Mr. BROWDER. Very closely. And I would be glad to inform you about what we stated in the recent national committee meeting attended by 650 leading Communists from all over the country, held in Chicago last week end, in which we reached a unanimous agreement on all of the issues of the day.

The CHAIRMAN. What are they?

Mr. BROWDER. First, an agreement supporting the policies of President Roosevelt in the present world situation; second, to agree to support and to explain the nonaggression pact between Germany and Italy and to point out how it has greatly helped—between the Soviet Union and Germany, and to point out how this greatly improved

the national situation of America, in the international situation, and helped the international influence of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. What else?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, a lot of things. I would be glad to explain them to you, if you want to listen.

Mr. STARNES. Let me ask you a question: Suppose the United States should, in the course of events, find it necessary to declare war on Germany, or Russia, or both; would your party support the United States of America?

Mr. BROWDER. As far as we can see the possible alinements, we would; but we will do everything possible to keep the United States out of war.

Mr. STARNES. Oh, that is what all of us would do; you do not have to be a Communist to do that. But I say, if it was necessary, in the course of human events, if we had to go in there again, where is your allegiance—to the United States of America or to some other nation?

Mr. BROWDER. To the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. As against Soviet Russia, if we had a war against Soviet Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. If it was possible for the United States to have a war with the Soviet Union, which would only be possible if the Trotskyites had succeeded in getting control, I would certainly be in favor, in the event of such a war, of supporting the United States.

Mr. STARNES. What about the Stalinites?

Mr. BROWDER. The Stalinites are carrying out a policy which brings them in close alinement with the United States. If they would change that policy, I would disagree with them.

Mr. STARNES. Wait a minute; you don't answer the question. I asked you what would be the course of your party in this country if, in the course of events, it found it necessary to go to war with the Soviet Union?

Mr. BROWDER. If it was to go to war with the Soviet Union in order to try to defeat—

Mr. STARNES. I want to know—

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute.

Mr. STARNES. I don't want any equivocation; I want a direct answer. I want to know what the course of Mr. Browder and his party would be if, in the course of events, it would be necessary for America and the Soviet Union to go to war. I don't want any equivocation.

Mr. BROWDER. I can only answer for myself personally, and I cannot say "My country, right or wrong." If I thought my country was wrong, I would oppose its entrance into such a war and conduct of such a war, just as I opposed the entrance of America into the war in 1917, when I thought it was wrong.

Mr. STARNES. That is just what I wanted to get you to say.

The CHAIRMAN. He was about to say, when he was interrupted, if the United States entered in a war with the Soviet Union, which was opposing all the principles of the Soviet Union—you would be against the United States in that war?

Mr. BROWDER. If it was trying, for example, to defeat policies of the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you would be on the side of Soviet Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I would oppose the entry of America into the war.

Mr. STARNES. How far would you go in that opposition?

Mr. BROWDER. As far as I went in 1917. I would express my opinion publicly and perhaps be put into jail.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Browder, what would you think—

Mr. STARNES. We were not at war with Soviet Russia, though, in 1917.

Mr. BROWDER. We were when we went to war with Germany.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Browder, would you think it could conceivably help the peace situation of the world for the United States at present to send a military mission to Berlin?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not propose that the United States develop a peace role in international affairs by copying the particular moves of any country. I think we have to develop the international role of our country on the basis of our situation and our relation to the rest of the world.

Mr. VOORHIS. I certainly think we have to develop it on the basis of America's own interests.

Mr. BROWDER. Of America—and American national interests.

Mr. VOORHIS. All right. Now, how can you conceivably say it is going to be of assistance to the peace of the United States for the Soviet Government to have a military mission in Berlin at the present moment?

Mr. BROWDER. I think you have been misinformed by the press about it.

Mr. VOORHIS. You do not think there is any military commission there?

Mr. BROWDER. I am quite sure there is not.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know; where do you get your information from?

Mr. BROWDER. I get it from the news associations, which give two kinds of information, one kind of which is placed in the headlines, the other of which is placed in the dispatch, if you read to the bottom of the dispatch; but you read the headlines.

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, I would certainly read to the bottom if I could find anything encouraging.

Mr. CASEY. As I understand it, Mr. Browder, you favor a democratic front against Germany?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. CASEY. An aggressive democratic front?

Mr. BROWDER. Not an aggressive democratic front, but a democratic front that is, by necessity, nonaggressive.

Mr. CASEY. And you, I think, stated somewhere in your book, Fighting for Peace, that Daladier could not be trusted?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. CASEY. To go through with this democratic front against the Nazis?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. CASEY. You also stated that Chamberlain could not be trusted to go through with this democratic front against the Nazis.

Mr. BROWDER. I did.

Mr. CASEY. Now, in view of what has happened, with Great Britain and France at war against Germany, do not you think that you should revise your opinion on that?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't. All the evidences have confirmed that distrust fully.

Mr. CASEY. What would you have said if Daladier, acting in behalf of France, made a nonaggression pact with Germany? Would you have criticized him?

Mr. BROWDER. Daladier, acting in behalf of France, did make a nonaggression pact with Germany at the expense of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. CASEY. What would you say if Chamberlain, acting in behalf of the democratic Government of Great Britain, made a nonaggression pact with Germany? Would you have criticized it?

Mr. BROWDER. Great Britain did do that.

The CHAIRMAN. He is not asking you that; he is asking you if you would criticize it.

Mr. CASEY. I take it that he did.

Mr. BROWDER. I criticized it when it happened.

Mr. CASEY. But you do not criticize Stalin for making a nonaggression pact with the Nazi Government?

Mr. BROWDER. The Soviet Union did not—

Mr. CASEY. I think that can be answered fairly simply.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, but a simple "yes" or "no" completely distorts the picture. If you want to understand it, of course, that is one thing; if you merely want to register certain fundamentals, that is another. I am at your mercy. If you want a "yes" or "no" answer, you can have it.

Mr. CASEY. I do not want to appear arbitrary, and I, for one member of the committee, am willing to listen to the answer, if it could be set forth quickly, without taking up a great deal of time.

Mr. BROWDER. That I would be very glad to answer.

Mr. CASEY. I think we ought to have it.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. BROWDER. The Soviet Union, in the pursuit of the aim to establish a peace front to prevent the outbreak of war, went much further than America had ever agreed to go. They offered to make a military alliance for mutual defense with Great Britain and France and to extend the guarantees of this alliance to every country in Europe threatened by aggression. They conducted negotiations for months, trying to arrive at an agreement. An agreement was blocked by the fact that Poland and the other Baltic states, which were the necessary scene of the threatening struggle, absolutely refused to agree to accept Soviet military help.

It therefore transpired, and the basis of this is clear that this stand was under the advice, or at least with the agreement of Chamberlain and Daladier—it therefore became clear that what was happening was that Chamberlain was allowing the world to drift into a disastrous war, without the conclusion of any agreement, and the Soviet Union was faced with the possibility that a war might be begun; that the world would be told it had pledged its support to Chamberlain; but no terms had been reached. In fact, there was a complete disagreement. And the world would be faced, would be led into a war under the assumption that the Soviet Union was already bound to Chamberlain, after that fact being present, and the Soviet Union being forbidden to take an active part in the war. But there cannot be a war with Germany. Under such circumstances, the

Soviet Union, in the protection of its own national interests, just the same as America has to protect its national interests, had demonstratively to show before the whole world it was not part of either camp and was not bound to support anybody, except an agreement was reached—and this is the situation today that the Soviet Union now occupies, in its principle, in the essence of the situation, a position closely analogous to that of America—which is neutral. It is defending its own national interests, but differs from America only insofar as it has proposed and tried to reach an active mutual-defense alliance, but failed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Do you believe there would have been a war today had that pact not been made?

Mr. BROWDER. I think there would not have been a war if Chamberlain had made a pact with the Soviet Union.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is it not also true we would not have had a war if the pact between Russia and Germany had not been made?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You think not?

Mr. BROWDER. The war was inevitable.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It did not take long, after that pact was signed, to have war?

Mr. BROWDER. That was why the pact was signed, because everybody knew war was coming; everybody knew Chamberlain refused to perfect a peace pact.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is it not true, Mr. Browder, it assured Germany she would not be attacked by Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; and assured the Soviet Union she would not be attacked by Germany.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Browder, is there any doubt in your mind as to who the aggressor nation is in this struggle?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not get that.

Mr. VOORHIS. Have you any doubt as to who is the aggressor nation?

Mr. BROWDER. I have no real doubt.

Mr. VOORHIS. And, as you expressed previously, you said the Soviet Union was against aggressor nations?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. And you think this pact with German, an aggressor nation as you determine it, is being against the aggressor?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. It is consistent with their being against it, to make a pact of nonaggression?

Mr. BROWDER. Absolutely. In essence, America has a past of non-aggression.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Browder, you have made a very concise statement relating to negotiations, the diplomatic negotiations, between Russia and Germany and some other countries. How is it you are so familiar with those diplomatic negotiations?

Mr. BROWDER. Because I read the press very carefully. It is all reported.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you have formed your opinion absolutely from reading the press in this matter?

Mr. BROWDER. Completely and entirely. I have no other source of information.

Mr. THOMAS. There is one other question I would like to ask you. Supposing this country should find itself in a war with Germany, or some other country—supposing we should find ourselves in a war with Soviet Russia, for instance, would you oppose conscription in this country as you opposed it in 1917?

Mr. BROWDER. I think, as I see the situation, if that possibility should develop, I would possibly not oppose conscription.

Mr. THOMAS. You would not oppose conscription?

Mr. BROWDER. I oppose conscription only because I oppose war; but if that war is just, conscription is the best way to conduct it.

Mr. THOMAS. Supposing your opinion was in the next war—assuming there would be a war, and say that the war would not be just, and yet the United States Government passed a law bringing about conscription: Would you then still oppose conscription in that event?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know what attitude I would take. I would have to judge that at the particular moment.

Mr. THOMAS. You just said a few minutes ago, if you thought the war was unjust, you would oppose conscription; that is what you said.

Mr. BROWDER. I said I would oppose the entrance into the war.

Mr. THOMAS. Supposing, though, you should feel that the war was unjust and you had your firm opinions on that—

Mr. BROWDER. I would speak against it.

Mr. THOMAS. But regardless of whether you spoke against it or not, suppose the United States Government should pass a conscription law, what would you do then?

Mr. BROWDER. I would speak against it.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; but they had already passed the law: Would you then still speak against it and urge the people not to obey it?

Mr. BROWDER. Then I don't know what I would do if once the law had been passed.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us proceed.

Mr. BROWDER. Could I complete my answer to this question about the significance of this book?

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have had enough about it. Let us proceed.

Mr. BROWDER. Just one moment. I think it is important for the purpose of this committee, because the essence of the question before the committee is to find un-Americanism, un-American activities, and I want to explain directly to this point that our opinions about the Soviet-German nonaggression pact are determined, in the first place, by our opinion as to what effect it has upon America. That was the first question we asked ourselves when the news began to come through that such a pact was in the making.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have gone far enough on that.

Mr. BROWDER. We asked ourselves, "How will this affect American national interests?" and the reason we are able so quickly and definitely to come to the support of the pact is because we found upon examination it greatly improved the situation of the United States in international affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us proceed; you have had an opportunity to explain.

All right; let us proceed, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Continuing with the list of expulsions from the Communist Party, with the grounds of expulsion, I note that a

member in California was expelled for distributing Upton Sinclair leaflets.

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct. I think it was a great mistake, and I have so expressed myself publicly many times.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you invited this man back into the party?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you think he should be invited back into the party?

Mr. BROWDER. That would depend entirely upon other considerations. If that is the only thing that stands between him and the party, he should have been back long ago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, he was right and the party was wrong?

Mr. BROWDER. As used in the political sense, but, perhaps, not in detail.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it be possible for the Comintern ever to be wrong?

Mr. BROWDER. It seeks the right. It is theoretically right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How about the practice?

Mr. BROWDER. I have seen it so in practice.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is so theoretically.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is, the Comintern is more or less infallible?

Mr. BROWDER. Nothing is infallible.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have not discerned any evidence of fallibility on the part of the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. We have made mistakes. They were mistakes on our part and not mistakes that the Comintern caused.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I notice that one ground of expulsion was for reporting a decision to the Democratic Party.

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know what the decision was, but if it was reported to an organization of the Democratic Party—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). Does it state definitely that it was a matter reported to the Democratic Party or some leading Democrat?

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was for reporting a decision to the Democratic Party.

Another expulsion is listed on the ground of a man's being an opportunist job seeker. Would you be able to clarify that matter?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; we have them. Some people join the Communist Party under the illusion, which they get from the daily newspapers, that the Communist Party tries to push any Communists forward in lucrative positions, and we have had people to join from that standpoint. They are quickly disillusioned, and if they do go immediately the party puts them out.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If he is seeking a job, he is an opportunist, if he is in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. If people try to use the Communist Party simply to get jobs, they have no place in the party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Another expulsion listed is on the ground of a person's being a petty bourgeois Social Democrat. Is that a ground of expulsion?

Mr. BROWDER. The Social Democratic organization is a particular group.

Mr. CASEY. That is used as an epithet.

Mr. BROWDER. We do have a technical classification of Social Democrat, and a political classification.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Another expulsion listed is for being a rumormonger. What would you say is a rumormonger?

Mr. BROWDER. He is the kind of person that President Roosevelt warned the country against Sunday night. We do not want that kind of people in our party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are they people spreading rumors and propaganda?

Mr. BROWDER. Spreading rumors for a particular purpose; rumors that cannot be substantiated, and which nobody can defend in public.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I note also that a person was expelled for being against the Friends of the Soviet Union, the specific charge being that he left behind unpaid bills for literature of the Friends of the Soviet Union. Do you think that a proper ground for expulsion from the party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I suppose you take into consideration whether, or not, he was able to pay for the literature. The Daily Workers being now in bankruptcy and unable to pay its bills, is not a party member entitled to the same consideration?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not think that was a question of bankruptcy. I think it was a question of irresponsibility.

Mr. STARNES. You don't mean to say that you would apply one rule to an individual and another rule to a corporation? It is a question of paying bills or a question of paying debts. Now, it is all right for an organization to welch on its debts, or be insolvent, but for an individual that means expulsion; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. We can hardly expel the Daily Worker from the Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. But you could dissolve or discontinue it.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; we could.

Mr. STARNES. Do you consider it a good policy or honest to have an insolvent group, and yet not frankly state that it is insolvent and cannot pay its debts?

Mr. BROWDER. Everybody who does business with the Daily Worker knows its condition. There is no subterfuge and nothing hidden. Everybody who does business with the Daily Worker knows that the normal income is somewhat less than the bills that are run up.

Mr. STARNES. Is that not true of the individual, that he can only pay when he has the income?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I notice that two others were expelled on the ground of being bourgeois ideologists. I suppose you would have the same comment there as for the previous one expelled on that ground. What is petty-bourgeois ideology?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know what it is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Here we have a case which I think requires some elaboration. You stated yesterday that you held insurance in the International Workers Order?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is insurance considered a capitalistic device, by any chance?

Mr. BROWDER. When you have it in America, it is capitalistic, but in the Soviet Union it is socialistic.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But in America, how can a Communist—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). It is capitalist, but for those living in a capitalist country—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). Was not this man expelled because he charged that the International Workers Order was a capitalistic instrument?

Mr. BROWDER. That is another thing. That refers to the International Workers Order as the instrument of a capitalist class, not of a workers' capitalism.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Another one was expelled for putting his position as part owner of a restaurant above his party. I take it that this means he was controlled by capitalist motives?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; that means that being a businessman he took a position which was contrary to the party position, as a motivating principle.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You also expel them for drunkenness?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Is that political?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; entirely political. I think Washington ought to know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not expel them for violating the laws of the United States by using false or illegal passports, do you?

Mr. BROWDER. It depends on the degree of moral issue involved in it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever expel anyone for using a false passport?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you do expel them for drunkenness and for all those things which have been described; but if he violates the law of the United States, and uses an illegal passport, as in the case of Krumben, you do not expel?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Several were expelled on the ground of holding a nationalistic attitude. Does that refer to the Nation or the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. That does not refer to support of the nation. That refers to a national as being non-Communist. That is an independent party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is the agit-prop of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. That term is no longer used. That term used to be used for what is now known as the educational department.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It originally stood for agitation and propaganda?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And in its place you have substituted the educational department?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you a publication entitled "Building Socialism in the Soviet Union." Have you ever seen that pamphlet before?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not remember it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Can you identify it by the title page? It is published by the Workers Library Publishers.

Mr. BROWDER. I assume it is authentic.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This pamphlet is by Leon Platt. Does Leon Platt use any other name in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. He is known as Martin Young.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is an organizer at Pittsburgh?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know which is the alias that he uses?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know which is the alias. I do not know whether—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). He has two names, one he uses as organizer and another name that he uses as author?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that was long before 1930, because I am familiar with all the books published by the Communist Party since 1930.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is a reference in the text to 1933 as the date. He says "the total for the 5-year period, 1928-29 to 1932-33." So it must have been published at a later date than 1932?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Communist Party once declared that war between the United States and the Soviet Union was inevitable, did it not?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; it did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It did in fact declare that war between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union was inevitable, did it not?

Mr. BROWDER. It declared it was quite probable.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will read from this pamphlet which we have just identified:

All these factors lead to unavoidable war against the Soviet Union.

To say that war is inevitable is not as strong as to say it is unavoidable?

Mr. BROWDER. That is an expression of personal opinion.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was published by the agit-prop department of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. BROWDER. Not everything published by that department is an expression of official opinion. It may be a matter of discussion.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But if the pamphlet set forth an issue, or a major issue, the party would not permit its imprint to go on it unless it subscribed to that position.

Mr. BROWDER. It has often happened that views contrary to the party's position have been printed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But I do not think it would be under the imprint of the party, showing that the party issued it.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I call your attention to the position which the agit-prop department of the Communist Party took on the question which you have just raised with reference to a war between the United States and the Soviet Government, reading from page 39 of the document:

The American Workers when called upon to go into this war against the Soviet Union, must refuse to fight against the Russian Workers, and go over on the side of the Red Army. The American Workers, like the Russian Workers in 1917, must turn the imperialist war into a civil war against their real enemies—the capitalist class of the United States which exploits and oppresses the American working class.

That statement was published over the imprint of the agit-prop department of the Communist Party of the United States as late as 1933.

Mr. BROWDER. I presume so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever published opinions corresponding to that, at other places, in the literature of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. In a general, theoretical way.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did?

Mr. BROWDER. The whole force and direction of the thought, argument, and propaganda of the Communist Party in the United States has been to show that the Soviet Union and the United States have a great and growing order of common interests which inevitably will bring them, not into collision, but into harmonious cooperation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is not responsive to the question. Has it been the fundamental movement of and tenet of the Communist Party movement for many years that, in the event of a war in which a capitalist state should engage, the workers in the capitalist state should turn that war into a civil war against their own government?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir. The Communist Party distinguishes between wars and wars. Some wars we support and some wars we oppose.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please identify O. Kuusinen?

Mr. BROWDER. He is a Finnish Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, is he not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And a member of the secretariat of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he one of the leading figures at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did not the American Communist Party recently celebrate his birthday and pay tribute to him in your publications?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I hold here a copy of a speech delivered by Mr. Kuusinen at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. Was that the congress at which the present line of the communist parties throughout the world was adopted in general?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1935?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So the statement by one of the highest authorities and leading figures of the Communist International at the Seventh World Congress would, in general, reflect the position of the Communist parties throughout the world today?

Mr. BROWDER. In general; yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will read from page 28 of Mr. Kuusinen's speech:

Comrades, the second imperialist World War is approaching. Preparations are being made for the most criminal of all criminal wars—a counter revolutionary imperialist attack on the Soviet country, the fatherland of the workers of all countries.

Mr. Browder, have you not frequently in your literature and your speeches for the Communist Party in the United States referred to the Soviet Union as the fatherland of the workers of all countries?

Mr. BROWDER. I have; yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is a common practice among Communists throughout the world, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. It is a quite usual expression.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Continuing with reference to this war which Kuusinen described as approaching, and stating the position of the Communists in other countries on that anticipated war, I read this:

We want to attack our class enemies in the rear, when they start the war against the Soviet Union. But how can we do so if the majority of the toiling youth follow, not us, but, for instance, the Catholic priests or the liberal chameleons.

We often repeat the slogan of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war against the bourgeois. In itself, the slogan is a good one, but it becomes an empty and dangerous phrase if we do nothing serious in advance to create a united youth front.

We need a revolutionary youth movement at least 10 times as broad as our parties, and a united youth front hundreds of times broader still. That this is entirely possible in many countries is shown by the achievements of our French and American young comrades.

That quotation you are familiar with?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You, perhaps, heard him deliver the speech?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not sure that I did, but I read it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is primarily important is that is what he stands for?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let us clearly understand what the statement was. This statement anticipates war against the Soviet Union, without naming the powers to fight against the Soviet Union: Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He describes the war as an imperialist war.

Mr. BROWDER. I think that a war against the Soviet Union would be an international imperialist war.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, when Kuusinen is talking of attacking our class enemies, he is referring to attacks made on class enemies in countries other than the Soviet Union.

Mr. BROWDER. He is; yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For example, if Great Britain, Germany, France, the United States, or any other capitalist powers were involved in this war against the Soviet Union, it would be the duty of the Communists in those countries to attack the enemies of the Soviet Union in those countries: Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; to undermine and weaken them so as to prevent war being carried on.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That would mean turning the imperialist war into a civil war?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; as in Germany now the task is to develop a civil war against Hitler.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He then proceeds to describe one way in which preparations may be made to attack class enemies in the rear through a revolutionary youth movement.

Mr. BROWDER. You are describing it—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Those are his words. I want to call attention especially to the fact that he says that the American youth comrades have demonstrated that it is entirely possible to build a revolutionary youth movement at least 10 times as broad as the party, and a united youth front hundreds of times broader still. The revolutionary youth movement, in the event of war between the United States and the

Soviet Government, would be expected to attack the United States Government, because he says they will turn it into a civil war.

Mr. BROWDER. You are assuming there that the United States would be an aggressor nation, and that it would attack the Soviet Union, but I refuse to assume that it will ever attack.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But assuming that it should attack the Soviet Government, or become involved in war against the Soviet Union, what then?

Mr. BROWDER. If it were possible for the American Government to do that, or if we assume that the American Government should make an aggressive war against the Soviet Union, I would stand as absolutely opposing such a war, and as doing everything possible to stop it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Even to turning such a war into a civil war?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; in every way I could to stop it. I cannot conceive, however, of America being an aggressor nation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In this address, Mr. Kuusinen made particular reference to the American united front, and the youth front, and if the United States should be involved in a war against the Soviet Union—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). He was speaking of America, and America not being an aggressor nation—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). Is it not unfortunate that he, in talking about the American united front, or the youth front, and that runs all the way through it, for the purpose of defending democracy, should be using that as an illustration of how the movement should be directed to turn such a war into a civil war? Was that not an unfortunate figure?

Mr. BROWDER. I say it is unfortunate that such things have to be misinterpreted.

Mr. MATTHEWS. His intention is clear.

Mr. BROWDER. I do not understand it the way you do at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you, in the event of a war against the Soviet Union try to turn that war into a civil war against the American Government?

Mr. BROWDER. I would try to stop aggression, wherever it took place. If the Soviet Union was guilty of aggression, I would be just as strongly against that aggression.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I take it that Stalin occupies a very important, if not a unique, position in the Communist movement of the world.

Mr. BROWDER. He carries great authority and his word is respected.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When he speaks, which is on rare occasions, I suppose, he speaks with care and precision, does he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he does; yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you familiar with the pamphlet entitled "Stalin's Speeches on the American Communist Party"?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Published by the central committee, Communist Party, U. S. A., in 1929.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; I am familiar with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will read to you from one of Stalin's speeches:

Therefore, we must put the question squarely to the members of the American delegation: When the draft assumes the force of an obligatory decision of the Comintern, do they consider themselves entitled not to submit to that

decision? We have argued the question in the commission for a whole month; we have had a number of discussions; we have spent a tremendous amount of time on the matter, time that might have been more profitably employed; we finally arrived at the point when the time for discussion was over and were on the eve of adopting a decision which must be compulsory for all members of the Comintern. And now the question arises: Do the members of the American delegation, as Communists, as Leninists, consider themselves entitled not to submit to the decision of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the American question.

You are familiar with that statement of Stalin?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That reflects the relationship between the Communist International and the American Communist Party. That decision was chiefly of interest to the American Communist Party. Now, I will read further from one of Stalin's speeches, with reference to the matter of American loyalty to the Comintern:

Can you picture a Communist, not a paper Communist, but a real Communist, avowing loyalty to the Comintern and at the same time refusing to accept responsibility for carrying out the decisions of the Comintern?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you avow loyalty to the Comintern, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you did not express that loyalty by carrying out the decisions of the Comintern—

Mr. BROWDER. That would mean I would disagree with them, and I would leave them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You would be a paper Communist?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not be a paper Communist; I would leave them. I would not call myself a Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Stalin called you a paper Communist under those circumstances.

I will read again from one of the speeches of Stalin, in which he says:

A few words regarding the vaunting manner in which the group of Comrade Lovestone speaks and represents itself here in the name of the whole party, in the name of 99 percent of the Communist Party of America. They never represent themselves otherwise than in the name of 99 percent of the party. One would think they have that 99 percent in their pockets. That is a bad manner, comrades of the American delegation. Let me remind you that Zinoviev and Trotzky also at one time played trumps with percentages, and assured everybody that they had secured or, at any rate, would secure, a 99-percent majority in the ranks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. You know, comrades, in what a farce the vainglory of Trotzky and Zinoviev ended. I, therefore, advise you not to play trumps with percentages. You declare you have a certain majority in the American Communist Party and that you will retain that majority under all circumstances. That is untrue, comrades of the American delegation, absolutely untrue. You had a majority because the American Communist Party until now regarded you as the determined supporters of the Communist International.

The group referred to by Stalin in this speech did have the majority in the Communist Party in the United States, did it not?

Mr. BROWDER. It was supported by a majority at one time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was supported by a majority at one time?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; for a period of about 18 months.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That majority was behind the group which is described here as the group of Comrade Lovestone; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Lovestone was secretary of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. For a period of 18 months.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who removed Lovestone from the secretaryship of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. The same national committee that elected him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he expelled by a decision of the Executive Committee of the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. No; he was expelled by the same Central Committee that had elected him secretary.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he expelled by the Central Control Commission of the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. He was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did Lovestone have the right to appeal his expulsion by the national committee?

Mr. BROWDER. He did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To the executive committee of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, in effect, the final authority on the question of Lovestone's expulsion was the Executive Committee of the Communist International; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is the question, and if that had been so they surely would have reviewed the case. That is the answer.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a matter of fact, he did appeal to the Executive Committee of the Communist International, did he not?

Mr. BROWDER. He did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he appeal to the Central Control Commission of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. He did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he appeal to any other body or agency of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know of any.

Mr. CASEY. Did he have a right to such an appeal?

Mr. BROWDER. Everybody has a right to appeal wherever they want to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to read from the Daily Worker of July 25, 1929, page 4, in reference to the Executive Committee of the Communist International, which is substantially the Communist International (and there follows here a considerable document which indicates that Lovestone did make an appeal to the Executive Committee of the Communist International).

Mr. BROWDER. My memory has failed me in that particular case; I did not remember it. I only remembered that he appealed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. That statement in the Daily Worker would be accurate authority, would it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; and also it carries information that the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of the United States acted upon it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the Daily Worker of July 29, 1929, there is set forth the "Decision of the Tenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the appeal of Lovestone."

Mr. BROWDER. That was on removing Lovestone from the Executive Committee of the C. I.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So the final authority on the question as to whether or not Lovestone remained in the Communist Party of the United States and the Communist International was the Executive Committee of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. Whether he remained a member in the Executive Committee of the Communist International. Whether he remained a member of the American committee that decision was made in America.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I beg your pardon. The statement at the top of this says that the decision was the—

Decision of the tenth plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the appeal of Jay Lovestone, member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, against his expulsion from the Communist Party of the United States of America.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. I suppose it is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not challenge that, do you, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I challenge what you said before, that he ceased to be a member on the decision of the Central Committee of the U. S. S. R.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was the Executive Committee of the International that gave that decision.

Mr. BROWDER. That is it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he have the right to appeal to the Executive Committee?

Mr. BROWDER. He had the right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that right recognized?

Mr. BROWDER. That right was recognized.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he go to Moscow and prosecute that appeal?

Mr. BROWDER. He did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he ever in Moscow in connection with the appeal?

Mr. BROWDER. He was not.

The CHAIRMAN. If he had been reinstated by the appeal board, you would have had to take him back into the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No; the question as to whether he would be retained would be by the Central Committee; they would have to decide whether to reconsider that decision or to affirm. In the last analysis the decision would have to be made in the Central Committee of the United States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then the phrase, "By the E. C. C. I." is somewhat meaningless, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. No; it means a great deal.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Why should he carry an appeal to a body which has less authority on the subject than the original expelling body?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, the original expulsion body is the only one that has the decision on that appeal, and the other has only the original authority.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Not the authority, but the original decision?

Mr. BROWDER. They can only appeal to the Central Committee of the American party.

Mr. STARNES. Has the Central Committee of the American party ever failed to accept the advice of that appellate body in the international organization?

Mr. BROWDER. They failed to accept such advice when they named Jay Lovestone as secretary.

Mr. STARNES. I am talking about an appeal.

Mr. BROWDER. On an appeal we have never had the issue before us.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, the Communist Party of the United States wanted Lovestone, but the Comintern did not want him?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; they knew he was a crook before the American party understood him.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the majority of the Communist Party of the United States wanted him.

Mr. BROWDER. He remained as secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. But the decision of Moscow finally prevailed.

Mr. BROWDER. He remained as secretary, and he had—

The CHAIRMAN. Their attitude finally prevailed?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any instance on record in which their attitude or decision has not finally prevailed?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know of any case in which there was any prolonged—more than a year—disagreement.

Mr. STARNES. But is there any instance on record in which their opinion did not eventually prevail?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not understand the question.

Mr. STARNES. He merely asked you whether in the case of a disagreement there was any case in which the international organization's opinion did not finally prevail?

Mr. BROWDER. There have been many occasions where the opinion of the Communist Party of the United States has prevailed.

Mr. STARNES. That does not answer the question. The question was, Has there ever been a case in which the international organization's opinion did not finally prevail?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; there have been cases in which the opinion developed in the United States has been approved and adopted by the International.

The CHAIRMAN. But there has been no case of disagreement on record of that kind?

Mr. BROWDER. No sustained disagreement.

(Thereupon the committee took a recess until 1:15 p. m.)

#### AFTER RECESS

#### TESTIMONY OF EARL R. BROWDER—Resumed

The committee reassembled at 1:15 p. m.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Whitley, you may proceed.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, yesterday there was certain information you promised to get for the committee. Have you secured that information?

Mr. BROWDER. The information I have to get from New York has not come yet. If it does not come today we will have to send for it.

We could not get the office on the phone after adjournment yesterday because there is an hour's difference in time. We sent somebody to New York last night for it. In reference to the information you asked about verifying a list of the national committee of the party, the list you gave me contains 61 names. Of these, 22 are not members of the national committee. That leaves some 39 that are. Those that are I have checked with a simple check, those that are not I have checked with an X, and the 21 names that are missing from that list are here in this supplemental list.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you indicated the members of the political committee?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I have not; but I can. [After marking list.] Those marked with an X on the side are members and candidates of the political committee.

(The matter referred to follows:)

MEMBERS OF POLITICAL COMMITTEE, C. P. U. S. A.

Wm. Z. Foster, Earl Browder, Alex Bittelman, Morris Childs, Gene Dennis, James W. Ford, C. A. Hathaway, Roy Hudson, Charles Krumbein, Robert Minor, Jack Stachel, Henry Winston, Rose Wortis.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, did you have an opportunity to get the names of the members of the secretariat of the Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. No; that has to come from New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the budget of the New York State organization?

Mr. BROWDER. That also has to come from New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the other items that you were to get?

Mr. BRODSKY. You wanted the States in which there is no party organization?

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have that?

Mr. BRODSKY. Only in this information that has to come from New York. Then you wanted a full list of the political bureau, and you wanted the names of the national committee, the national committee list checked, and that has been done. You wanted the budget of the New York district, and that will come along. You wanted a complete list of the secretariat of the Communist International, and that will have to come later.

Mr. WHITLEY. With identifying data.

Mr. BRODSKY. With identifying data as to the party to which he belongs.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if we could get the names and addresses of the officers of each branch in the United States, so if we decide to subpoena the members of the executive committees of the respective branches we would have them available.

Mr. BROWDER. We do not have those branch addresses in the national office. We only have the district office addresses.

The CHAIRMAN. You would have to get them from the district branches?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, have you or your organization at any time supported the idea of a dictatorship as a desirable form of government for this country?

Mr. BROWDER. Not in the sense in which dictatorship is understood in the ordinary term in political conversation. We have always opposed that.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you and your organization in favor of the maintenance of freedom of speech and the press as desirable particularly for minorities in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. We are.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you or your organization receive any direct or indirect instructions from any foreign agency or power?

Mr. BROWDER. We do not.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the emblem of your organization?

Mr. BROWDER. The crossed hammer and sickle.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does your organization maintain any secret form of organization in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does your organization circulate printed matter received from any foreign country?

Mr. BROWDER. In the book shops we sell publications printed in the Soviet Union, some books printed there, and a newspaper. We also sell newspapers from France, from England, and to a certain extent, from Canada and Mexico, although in much smaller numbers. There is some distribution of material printed in other countries. That is a relatively small part of our distribution of literature.

Mr. WHITLEY. Let me ask you another question which you have previously answered, but I will ask it again, perhaps in a little different form. Does your organization advocate civil war, or the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not, and it actively opposes any such idea.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, do you know Juliet Stuart Poyntz?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was she ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. She was at one time.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long was she a member of the party, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know exactly.

Mr. WHITLEY. For a number of years?

Mr. BROWDER. A number of years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was she an active member of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. At a period around 1923 to 1926.

Mr. WHITLEY. She was active?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what capacity was she particularly active?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe at that time she was a member of the Central Committee, for 2 or 3 years, and a speaker.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which is the highest administrative body of the party, so she was not just a rank and file member?

Mr. BROWDER. Not at that time; from 1923 to 1926.

Mr. WHITLEY. When did she cease her party activity, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not be sure of the exact date, and I cannot recall just the time, but I think since about 1929.

Mr. WHITLEY. She was at one time a secretary of the International Labor Defense, was she not?

Mr. BROWDER. That is possible; I am not certain.

Mr. WHITLEY. As a matter of fact, she was extremely active, especially in a speaking capacity, and certainly on such occasions in connection with her activities?

Mr. BROWDER. She was a speaker.

Mr. WHITLEY. And played a prominent part in the party's activities over a period of many years?

Mr. BROWDER. Two or three years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you limit it to 2 or 3 years?

Mr. BROWDER. That is all I am familiar with.

Mr. WHITLEY. When did you last see Juliet Stuart Poyntz?

Mr. BROWDER. About 1929.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just before you became general secretary of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. After that time you did not see her; as far as her active party associations were concerned, she was not active in the party's business?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know what happened to Juliet Stuart Poyntz, or where she is now?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have not seen her or heard from her since 1929?

Mr. BROWDER. Approximately 10 years.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have no information at all as to what might have happened to her, or where she might be at the present moment?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I have heard her name only as it was mentioned in the newspapers.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which was in connection with her disappearance in New York in June 1937?

Mr. BROWDER. Something like that.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether she was ever employed by or connected with any agency of the Soviet Government?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Whether she was a member of or working for the OGPU?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, have any members of your family held official positions with the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. I have a brother who is at the present time a section organizer in New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. A section organizer for the New York district?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other positions has he held with the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Positions in the party—I could not say. I recall certain administrative positions, appointive positions, not elective.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you name those?

Mr. BROWDER. For some time he was the financial secretary for the New York district.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was until fairly recently, was it not?

Mr. BROWDER. A few months ago.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his name?

Mr. WHITLEY. William Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are there any other official positions he has held in the party?

Mr. BROWDER. He has been an official in some of the corporations; I am not familiar with the details.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was he ever president of the Comprodaily Publishing Co.?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he was.

Mr. WHITLEY. During what period?

Mr. BROWDER. That I could not say.

Mr. WHITLEY. For how long a period?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not say how long.

Mr. WHITLEY. He was not still president at the time of the recent bankruptcy, was he?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he was president at the time of the sale of the property.

Mr. WHITLEY. Incidentally, Mr. Browder, you also promised to get information as to the directors of those corporations.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That will have to come from New York also?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, do any other members of your family hold official positions in the Communist Party in this country or in any other country?

Mr. BROWDER. They do not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do any members of your family, past or present, hold any official positions with the Comintern or with the Soviet Government?

Mr. BROWDER. They do not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is your sister, Margaret Browder, employed in any capacity by the Soviet Government or the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I think not. I see her only occasionally, and I cannot say.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where is she residing now?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know; I cannot take the personal responsibility of explaining her presence or her activities; but, to the best of my knowledge and belief, she is not and has not been—

Mr. WHITLEY. She has no official connection, to the best of your knowledge, and has never had any official connection?

Mr. BROWDER. To the best of my knowledge, she is not now and has not in the past been officially connected with any government institution.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or with the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not say with the Communist Party. She has been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Over what period?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know the exact date of her joining, but I would say it was in the early twenties.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was she an active party member?

Mr. BROWDER. She was an active party member.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is she in the United States at the present time, or do you know?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, do you know whether she has ever been used to travel on an illegal passport?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether she has ever been known under the name of Jean Montgomery?

Mr. BROWDER. I have not heard that name except as reported in the newspapers.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, does your former wife, Catherine Harris, occupy any official position with the Communist Party in this country or elsewhere?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not have a former wife by that name.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is her name, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I only had one former wife, whose name was Gladys Browder.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is she a member of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. She is not; she is an invalid.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has she ever had an official connection with the party?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. In this country or elsewhere?

Mr. BROWDER. Not at all.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any relatives connected with the Peoples World, the publication in San Francisco?

Mr. BROWDER. Relatives?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is Harrison George a brother-in-law of yours?

Mr. BROWDER. He was at one time married to my sister, years ago, and they were divorced.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he connected with the Peoples World?

Mr. BROWDER. He is one of the editors of the Peoples World.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, is your present wife a citizen of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. She is not.

Mr. WHITLEY. She is not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has she ever held any official position with the Communist Party of the Soviet Government?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. She has not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was she one of the judges of the "red" tribunal in Moscow in 1921 or 1922, or approximately that period?

Mr. BROWDER. To the best of my knowledge and belief; no.

The CHAIRMAN. Has she ever told you that she was?

Mr. BROWDER. She has not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was her name Anna Gluzman?

Mr. BROWDER. It was not.

Mr. WHITLEY. It was not?

Will you give her maiden name?

Mr. BRODSKY. Mr. Chairman, I object to that as entirely immaterial in connection with the object of this committee's investigation; what can that have to do with it?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the object of getting that information?

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, the allegation has been made and I am trying to be fair to Mr. Browder, to prove, disprove, or to establish that some of his relatives at present, or have in the past, held official position in the Communist Party in the Soviet Union and I do not see there would be any objection to securing that information.

Mr. BRODSKY. It seems to me that if Mr. Browder wants to answer the allegations he could answer them, but I do not think this is the place to answer allegations of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be the materiality of getting his wife's first name?

Mr. WHITLEY. It is just merely for the purpose of identification. I will say that the allegations were that she was formerly a member of the "red" tribunal and it certainly would show a connection with the Soviet Government, at least, to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, pass to some other question.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The question was what was his wife's maiden name. They have got some correspondence, apparently, showing some connection between them. Suppose we pass to another question. I am not certain about it.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems to me that Mr. Browder would be glad to answer the question.

Mr. BRODSKY. I have made my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we pass on to some other question.

Mr. THOMAS. Does Mr. Browder object to answering it?

The CHAIRMAN. There has to be a line drawn somewhere.

Mr. BROWDER. I think there has, Mr. Chairman; I think there must be some line drawn somewhere defining the scope of an inquiry such as this.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us pass on, for the time being, to another question.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, are the objectives and the program of the Communist Party today substantially the same as they have always been?

Mr. BROWDER. The objectives and the program, insofar as they relate to the goal and the transformation of our system to that of socialism in the place of capitalism, to a system without exploitation in place of a system with exploitation, to a system of common ownership of the means of production in place of a system of private ownership, in all those respects, the objectives and the program of the party have been continuous throughout its existence.

Mr. WHITLEY. The tactics and the strategy change from time to time but the fundamental objectives and the program have remained substantially the same?

Mr. BROWDER. The fundamental objectives have remained substantially the same.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything further, Mr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, you stated that to the best of your knowledge Juliet Stuart Poyntz had not been active in the Communist Party since 1929.

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I would not be certain about the exact date; I don't remember her having been active since I became the secretary.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe the national headquarters gave out a statement to the press in December 1937 to the effect that Juliet Stuart Poyntz had not been active subsequent to 1928. The statement read—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). I am not certain about the exact date.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you not know that in 1934 the Daily Worker, on the first page, in an early January issue, printed a photograph of Juliet Stuart Poyntz with the statement that she had a clash with Mayor LaGuardia at a demonstration at the City Hall where she headed a delegation of the Trade Union League?

Mr. BROWDER. I was not familiar with that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are not familiar with that?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, will you please identify for us, briefly, Mr. Molotov?

Mr. BROWDER. That is the present Premier, the foreign commissar of the Soviet Union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So that what Mr. Molotov might have to say about the decisions or acts of the Communist International would be authoritative, would they not?

Mr. BROWDER. I would assume so; he is a responsible man.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I read you from an issue of the International Press Correspondence of September 12, 1929, in which Mr. Molotov has the following to say:

The Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International effected a radical renovation of the executive of the American Communist Party.

This morning, Mr. Browder, you stated that the leadership of the American Communist Party had been removed by the National Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is in conflict, is it not, with the statement which I have just read from Molotov?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not in conflict.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will read it again.

The Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International effected a radical renovation—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS (continuing reading) :

of the executives of the American Communist Party.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please state what is meant by "effected a radical renovation."

Mr. BROWDER. They exposed the falseness of the claims of the Lovestone leaders in the American party, effecting a change of opinions in the Central Committee which resulted in the change of leadership.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, in the parlance of the Communist Party, what do you understand by the words "transmission belts"?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that if we begin to define all these technical terms of policy we will be here a very long time.

Transmission belt is a technical term in the technical discussion of the Communist movement.

The CHAIRMAN. You know what the words mean, do you not?

Mr. BROWDER. I think I do, but it might be difficult to explain to people who have not in any way familiarized the technical terms of the theories.

The CHAIRMAN. You are an expert on that subject, and we want enlightenment.

Mr. BROWDER. I haven't the slightest objection to enlightening you.

The CHAIRMAN. Make it as brief as you can.

Mr. BROWDER. My only objection to being brief in defining terms of policy is it does not give a clear explanation when you are dealing with such terms.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us some idea of it; what do you mean when you say "transmission belt"?

Mr. BROWDER. "Transmission belts" is a technical term referring to the tactics whereby the Communists establish their relations with the masses of people; it defines the channel of placing themselves before the masses of the majority of people. It is a technical term; those contacts are called transmission belts.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is sufficient.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. Mr. Browder, will you please name a few of the transmission belts of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. The principal transmission belt of the Communist Party to the masses of people is the policy—the policy—in the first place, of peace for America, and every mass organization—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). That is not responsive to the question.

Mr. BROWDER (continuing). And every mass organization which expresses this desire for peace thereby becomes a transmission belt between the Communist Party and the masses.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, will you please name some of the transmission belts of the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. The trade-unions of America; the American Federation of Labor; the C. I. O.; the peace societies of all parties, especially those that are not established strictly on the policy of isolation, including specially the large, mass peace movements; the American League for Peace and Democracy, and large organized peace movements; and, in general, I would say every organization which stands for any sort of concerted effort to maintain peace in the world, becomes thereby a transmission belt between the masses and the Communists, and one of the efforts of the Communist Party is to try to have its members join every organization which tends in that direction.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A great deal has been written in the Communist press on the subject of transmission belts, has there not, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not say a great deal.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Enough to make it perfectly clear what is understood by the term "transmission belt."

Mr. BROWDER. Not to make it clear to everybody yet; it requires clarification.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In these discussions of transmission belts in the literature of the Communist Party a number of organizations have been named. There has been no reference to the fact that "policy" is a transmission belt.

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes, there has; I would be glad to cite you a number of instances.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All right. Forget that for the moment. The point I would like for you to clear up is that in your naming of

the transmission belts in this country just now, you have refrained from mentioning the names which have been customarily cited in Communist Party literature.

Mr. BROWDER. I beg your pardon; I mentioned several.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask that an article by C. A. Hathaway in the Communist of May 1931, on the use of transmission belts in the struggle for the masses, be incorporated in the record.

This is not a lengthy article but it seems to be a very clear and full statement of the subject of transmission belts, in the parlance of the Communist Party.

Mr. BROWDER. Will you allow me to volunteer that if you exclude a consideration of policy as suggested by the questioner you will not have any idea whatsoever of the subject under discussion? To obtain its meaning it must be taken in conjunction with the policy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to read a portion of this Hathaway discussion on transmission belts. This is from an editorial appearing in the Pravda, the official publication of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

The day-to-day work of the Communist Party, U. S. A., still bears a purely propaganda character. The party has as yet come out before the masses only with general slogans, failing to concentrate attention on the immediate, everyday demands of the masses. The trade-unions have, in fact, only dedicated the party. The result of all this has been a considerable weakening of the party's contact with the masses, passivity, and lagging behind the general mass movement, and a consequent strengthening of opportunist tendencies, especially the "right" danger, in the various sections of the party.

Now, that editorial from Pravda is discussed in connection with the Communist Party of the United States of America. Continuing with Mr. Hathaway's discussion under the heading entitled "Utilize Transmission Belts":

What must we do?

In the first place, we must break definitely with the construction that Communist work consists solely in direct efforts to build the Communist Party and in recruiting new members. We must learn to set up and work through a whole series of mass organizations and in this way also develop our party work. Our chief error is our failure to understand the role of and to systematically utilize mass organizations as transmission belts to the broad masses of nonparty workers.

In a parenthesis in that quotation are named by initials examples of some of the transmission belts set up by the Communist Party and through which the Communist Party works. These are the "T. U. U. L." meaning the Trade Union Unity League; Unemployed Councils; "I. L. D." standing for International Labor Defense; "W. I. R." standing for Workers International Relief"; "L. S. N. R." standing for League for Struggle for Negro Rights, and so forth.

Mr. THOMAS. Are there any more?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In another part of the article there are others named. You are familiar with this discussion of Mr. Hathaway?

Mr. BROWDER. I am familiar with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you refer to your notes, Mr. Browder, and tell me if you gave by name any of the organizations here listed as transmission belts in reply to the question a moment ago?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I did.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did?

Mr. BROWDER. I referred to the trade-unions and the American League for Peace and Democracy. They are the more important ones.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were these organizations, here named as transmission belts, set up by the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. They were not set up by the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then what Hathaway said here was in error when he said that they were set up by the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not think he said so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will read it again.

Mr. BROWDER. If he said so it is in error.

Mr. MATTHEWS (reading):

We must learn to set up and work through the whole series of mass organizations and in this way also develop our party work.

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that is precisely how it was discussed at that time, to learn that it is not as effective for the Communist Party to set up organizations, but that it is more effective to have the members work through established and existing mass organizations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; but the Communist Party did set up the International Labor Defense?

Mr. BROWDER. It took a part in setting it up.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. Now you have named one of the existing organizations as a transmission belt, the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. BROWDER. I have named also the trade-unions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. BROWDER. The American Federation of Labor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Congress for—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). The C. I. O.

Mr. VOORHIS. In that connection I think there should be a distinction made between the willing and unwilling transmission belts. In other words, it does not seem to me it gives an accurate picture unless you do.

Mr. BROWDER. The transmission belt—

The CHAIRMAN. I think it has been made perfectly clear that this is what the Communist Party itself thinks and is not what representatives of these various organizations, the American Federation of Labor or the other organizations believe. In other words, it is purely a unilateral proposition. You have no thought of saying that you created them.

Mr. BROWDER. Of course not. If any member of this committee should use the committee as a transmission belt for a particular idea, that does not involve the implication that it was organized for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. And the fact that you have organized and that you have Communists, members in these organizations, the trade-unions, does not mean the trade movement is to do the Communist work.

Mr. BROWDER. Certainly not, just as a trade-union organization in a particular State may have in it members of the Democratic and Republican Parties does not mean it is the Party, nor does it in any way involve the trade-union as a part of the Democratic Party nor does it mean that the party controls these trade-unions.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; let us proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Here is the next quotation from this article by Mr. Hathaway, and I want to ask Mr. Browder if he recognizes this as common parlance in the Communist Party. This was a quotation from Kuusinen.

We must create a whole solar system of organizations and smaller committees around the Communist Party, so to speak, smaller organizations working actually under the influence of our party.

Do you recognize that as parlance of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I recognize the quotation. I do not accept that as describing our policy now.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; but in the past has the Communist Party attempted to create a whole solar system of organizations and smaller committees around the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. We have made some efforts but we failed.

Mr. STARNES. It was the policy at one time?

Mr. BROWDER. That indicates efforts were made to use the Communist influence through smaller organizations and have smaller organizations started.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is the change in policy due to the fact perhaps that other persons have set up organizations, which are more convenient for the Communist Party to use as transmission belts; was that the cause of the change?

Mr. BROWDER. It is due to the fact that whereas in previous years the purpose was, in presenting a progressive movement, we were trying to create organizations to do it and at the present time we are using organizations that have already been created.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you do use the present organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As transmission belts?

Mr. BROWDER. Of course.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Of course.

Mr. MATTHEWS. To quote from Stalin, in Stalin on "Problems of Leninism," on this need for transmission belts in relations to the party. What Hathaway states here is more sharply set forth than in previous quotations:

The proletariat needs these belts, these levers (the mass organizations) and this guiding force (the party) because without them it would, in its struggle for victory, be like a weaponless army in the face of organized and armed capital.

Lastly we come to the party of the proletariat, the proletarian vanguard. Its strength lies in the fact that it attracts to its ranks the best elements of all the mass organizations of the proletariat. Its function is to unify the work of all the mass organizations of the proletariat, without exception, and to guide their activities toward a single end, that of the liberation of the proletariat.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, Mr. Browder, will you tell me, please, whether or not the Friends of the Soviet Union was set up by the Communist Party as a transmission belt?

Mr. BROWDER. It was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the International Workers Order set up as a transmission belt by the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. It was not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I read from your book entitled "Communism in the United States," page 74:

Since the seventh convention we have made another important addition to the list of mass revolutionary organizations. This is the mutual benefit society, International Workers Order.

Was that a correct statement?

Mr. BROWDER. That is a correct statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that not an absolutely contradictory statement to what you have just said?

Mr. BROWDER. No; it is not, because we were inferring that the resolution of the I. W. O. followed the desire of the Communist Party to create an organization itself. That was not the origin of the I. W. O. The I. W. O. originated as an organization to provide for fraternal insurance for all working class of people and the Communist gave their entire help—

Mr. THOMAS. I think the witness should be instructed to just answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is trying to accord the witnesses the opportunity of making an explanation, all witnesses, who appear before the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. And I am in accord with that—

The CHAIRMAN. I think a witness is entitled to explain something that cannot be answered by a "yes" and "no" answer.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the definition of a transmission belt would you include the International Workers Order as a transmission belt?

Mr. BROWDER. Every mass organization, without exception—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I am asking about this one.

Mr. BROWDER (continuing). In which there is a Communist interest, is a transmission belt.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, will you please answer that?

Mr. BROWDER. I think I am.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to know if the International Workers Order is considered by you as a transmission belt?

The CHAIRMAN. He is asking you about a specific organization. You can say whether it is.

Mr. BROWDER. I can say "yes"; it is, emphatically.

The CHAIRMAN. You have already said that the others are.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And it was set up by the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. It was not set up by the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What do you mean by "since the seventh convention we have made another important addition to the list of mass organizations, the International Workers Order"?

Mr. BROWDER. The "we" is a general term, includes everyone cooperating together. I was not referring to the fact that the Communist Party had done this. The Communist Party, as such, as an organization, had nothing to do with the I. W. O. I myself—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I think you have answered the question.

Mr. THOMAS. I think he has.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The statement is to that effect, if I remember, in your report delivered to the Eighth Congress of the Communist Party in 1934; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; and in 1936 I made a report saying that we had elected Roosevelt President of the United States, but I didn't mean the Communists had.

The CHAIRMAN. What you are saying, in the use of the word "we" everybody who was sympathetic with the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Everyone who was with the I. W. O.; not with the Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But let us see, if we can, in your use of the word "we" that you did not mean Communists.

Mr. BROWDER. I mean more inclusive.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; but you did not mean to include more than those who sympathized with the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I mean to include all those who helped to establish the I. W. O.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say here that this "we" have set up the mass revolutionary organization?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That would be evidence, I presume, that they were sympathetic to the revolution?

Mr. BROWDER. At that time most of the members were members of the Communist Party. Since that time it has been broadened far beyond that, and the Communists are now a minority in the organization, in the last years, and you could not describe their actions as revolutionary.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you consider the Workers Alliance one of the transmission belts in the formation of which the Communist Party played a leading role?

Mr. BROWDER. In the same sense in which the trade unions are.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I read from your book *The Peoples Front*, page 49:

It was the Communists who raised the slogan of national unification, fought for it consistently, and finally brought about the merger of all into the Workers Alliance, which is now broadened into an all-inclusive national organization of unemployed workers.

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is a correct statement?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Here you say the Communists—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS (continuing). Brought about the merger—

Mr. BROWDER. It was the Communists who convinced the others—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Into the Workers Alliance.

Mr. BROWDER. The Communists who fought for and convinced the others.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would the same hold true of the formation of the American Students Union, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Not so clearly; there were a number of Communists who worked for it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it not the Young Communist League rather than the party that took the initiative in the formation of the American Students Union?

That is set forth on pages 44 and 45.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right, is it; you did not answer?

Mr. BROWDER. That is approximately true.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the Lincoln Battalion set up by the Communist Party, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. It was not. It was set up by the veterans returning from Spain.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it composed chiefly of members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say about 55 to 60 percent.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On page 182 of this book, *The People's Front*, you said:

And not the least source of our pride is the fact that over 60 percent of the Lincoln Battalion members are members of the Communist Party.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. I thought you were referring to the organization Friends of the Lincoln Battalion.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I am referring to the Lincoln Battalion itself. But your statement also refers to the Friends of the Lincoln Battalion?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy created largely through the initiative of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say it was created through merging of the initiative from many sources. There were many people moving simultaneously in the same direction at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On page 75 of your book *Communism in the United States* you describe the International Labor Defense as a mass organization "contributing to the general strengthening of the revolutionary movement."

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that the description which you support today?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, today it is merged more in the broad progressive movement of the day. At that time it had very little to do except in connection with the activities of the Communist Party. In later years it broadened out very much. Other people came into it on a much larger scale and took over the direction of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, in 1933 the Communist Party led the United States Congress Against War, did it not?

Mr. BROWDER. I think we had something to do with the leadership. We were in it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your book *Communism in the United States*, on page 183, you wrote:

Our most successful application of the united front has been in the antiwar and anti-Fascist movement. We led a highly successful United States Congress Against War, which brought together 2,616 delegates from all over the country, and unanimously adopted a manifesto and program which is politically satisfactory.

Does the "we" here refer to the Communist Party or to a broader group?

Mr. BROWDER. To give you a really authoritative answer on the grammar of it, I would have to examine it; but politically it substantially means the Communists.

(The book referred to was handed to the witness.)

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; that could be interpreted in the narrow sense, in which case it would be rather boastful, and I would have to apologize for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, how do you interpret it? That is the question. What did it mean when you said that? Did you mean the Communist Party or a broader group?

Mr. BROWDER. I was probably falling into boastfulness then, without mentioning the others that helped.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by boastfulness?

Mr. BROWDER. I mean that really the first congress contained so many other people without whose help and initiative it would have been impossible to claim full credit for the Communists; that I was not modest.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you should have taken into consideration the fellow travelers along with you?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; go ahead.

Mr. CASEY. Quite a natural error with most writers?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I think it is not a natural error except as naturally people may fall into the habit of each one claiming the credit which should be divided among a number of persons.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe at one time, Mr. Browder, you gave me credit for a part in the formation of that congress.

Mr. BROWDER. I believe that you played a certain role in it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. However, on page 184 of the book, Communism in the United States, you wrote:

The congress from the beginning was led by our party quite openly.

That is quite specific in identifying the organizing element as the Communist Party; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is as far as party influence was concerned. The Socialist Party attempted to lead it in a different direction.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that statement true? Let us get the answer.

Mr. BROWDER. There is a certain truth in it, but it does not give the complete picture.

Mr. STARNES. No single statement does, in your view.

Mr. BROWDER. Sometimes it does.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a simple statement that your party led the movement from the beginning. There is nothing complicated about that. Was that true or untrue?

Mr. BROWDER. That was the truth as we saw it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all we want. Go ahead.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, will you please name the organization which was set up at this United States Congress Against War?

Mr. BROWDER. The American League Against War and Fascism.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that subsequently became the American League for Peace and Democracy; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did the United States Congress Against War, and therefore the American League Against War and Fascism and the American League for Peace and Democracy, derive their initial impulse from what is known in Communist circles as the Amsterdam Congress?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe that was taken as the starting point for the establishment of the initiating committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was not the leading figure in the Amsterdam Congress Henri Barbusse of France?

Mr. BROWDER. Henri Barbusse, associated with Romaine Rolland.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was Henri Barbusse a member of the Communist Party of France?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know when he became a member. He was a member of the Communist Party in France when he died.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he a member at the time of the calling of the Amsterdam Congress in 1932?

Mr. BROWDER. That I do not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he a member of the Communist Party when he came to the United States in 1933 to address the United States Congress Against War?

Mr. BROWDER. That I do not know. He did not introduce himself to me as a member of the Communist Party, and he acted as an independent person.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not recall that when he landed at the pier he stated to the press that he was a member of the Communist Party of France?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not remember that. I know that he declared that he was in close sympathy with communism.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have testified already, Mr. Browder, that you were at one time, or for a period of years, one of the vice chairmen of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. BROWDER. From the time of its foundation until 1937.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has the American League for Peace and Democracy—and by that I mean the preceding organization as well—ever taken a position on the question with which it deals mainly, the question of war, which is contrary to the line of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, at the Cleveland convention—I forget exactly the year now; the convention held in Cleveland—the program that was adopted was much closer to the wishes of the Socialist Party than those of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The American League has gone on record quite consistently as opposed to fascism, has it not?

Mr. BROWDER. It has.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has it ever gone on record as opposed to communism?

Mr. BROWDER. It has not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have there ever been attempts in congresses of the American League to introduce resolutions condemning communism?

Mr. BROWDER. There have not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you not recall that one such resolution was introduced in Pittsburgh by a member from the floor?

Mr. BROWDER. I was not familiar with that. I did not know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not know that such a resolution was introduced at the Washington congress of the American League this year?

Mr. BROWDER. I was not in the Washington congress.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you are confident that no such resolution has ever been seriously considered by the American League?

Mr. BROWDER. I had not heard of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And certainly none has ever been passed, as you have stated?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if it does not interrupt, as a matter of fact, the American League recently issued a statement commanding the pact between Russia and Germany, did it not?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe that they did. I believe the spokesman of the American League issued a newspaper statement declaring that there was no reason in fact to interpret the nonaggression pact as an alliance between Germany and the Soviet Union, as was being done in the newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, he said that it was a distinct step toward peace, did he not?

Mr. BROWDER. And that it had been a distinct contribution to strengthening the position of the United States in world affairs, and to peace.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish Mr. Browder would express what he means by strengthening the position of the United States in world affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. If you do not mind, let him complete the question.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that he complete the question and then allow Mr. Browder to make a speech, as long as he wants to.

Mr. VOORHIS. Not necessarily a speech, but I would like to have an explanation of what he means by that.

Mr. MASON. And so would I.

The CHAIRMAN. We will get to that in just a little while.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have one other source here on the subject of transmission belts. The pamphlet by Alex Bittelman entitled "The Communist Party in Action," on page 51, states that "the principal transmission belts between the Communist Parties and the broad masses of the workers" are the independent revolutionary trade-unions.

To what is reference made there, Mr. Browder, in that phrase, "independent revolutionary trade-unions"?

Mr. BROWDER. I assume that that was written at a time when it would be referring to the unions of the T. U. U. L.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are quite sure, as a matter of fact, that it does refer to the unions of the T. U. U. L.?

Mr. BROWDER. I would feel quite confident.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Again, on page 56 of this pamphlet, Mr. Bittelman says:

In speaking of the importance of transmission belts between the party and the masses, we must remember that besides the unions there are other nonparty mass organizations, already existing, and others that we undertake to organize in the course of the developing counteroffensive of the proletariat. We should refer here to such nonparty mass organizations as the International Labor Defense, the Workers International Relief, various organizations in the struggle for Negro rights, the League of Struggle for Negro rights (L. S. N. R.), etc.

Of course, some of these organizations are as yet far from being mass organizations. Our task, therefore, consists in widening them, broadening them out, and transforming them into real mass movements. Also, in the course of developing the proletarian counteroffensive, we are resorting to the building up of various nonparty mass organs on a united-front basis, as, for instance, the building up of the unemployed committees and councils, antiwar committees, etc.

Here the important thing to remember is that the party must build up and develop transmission belts between itself and the class, following the tactics of the united front from below with the widest masses of workers on the basis of a common struggle for their daily and most burning needs. All Communists in such organizations must organize themselves into a party fraction working under the direction of their respective leading committees of the party.

Does that statement set forth the view which the Communist Party held on the subject of transmission belts and the way in which the party would control them, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct; but there have been very sharp changes in the methods of work of the Communists in the last years—especially the whole system of organizing fractions of the Communists inside the mass organizations has been completely abolished.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There was a time, however, when the fraction which was composed of the members of the Communist Party mass organizations was charged with the responsibility by the party of seeing to it that the party line was adequately defended and adopted by the national organization; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that the first responsibility was to see that the organization was built and the organization's own aims were taken care of, and, secondly, within the limitation of that, to advance the line of the Communist Party. But, as I said before, that whole practice of having Communists work as organized groups inside the mass organizations has been discontinued and completely abolished.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please tell us, Mr. Browder, when it was abolished?

Mr. BROWDER. In 1937.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In 1937?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything of record?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes. I do not have it where I can lay my hand on it. But in the March issue of the Communist of 1939 there are still discussions of the Communist Party nuclei and fractions in the various organizations.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. Every time we meet we have discussions about the clarification of this question everywhere, and the cleaning out of all practices in the work of organized fractions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When did the party cease the publication of the so-called shop committee papers?

Mr. BROWDER. That was just before the tenth convention.

Mr. MATTHEWS. About a year and a half ago?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; early in 1938.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then you mean to say that at the present time the Communist Party does not maintain a fraction organization in any mass organization of any kind whatsoever?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not. It prohibits the formation of fractions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In what way is the viewpoint, or let us say the revolutionary policy of the party, now transmitted from the party, which is the vanguard of the proletariat, to the broad masses?

Mr. BROWDER. We rely entirely upon the capacities of individual Communists to adequately present the viewpoint of the Communist Party before the masses.

The CHAIRMAN. Right at that point, those Communists openly admit their membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, they cannot develop Communist ideas very well without it.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean, there are no pains taken to conceal their identity?

Mr. BROWDER. No; of course not.

The CHAIRMAN. So that there is no reason why others in the organization should not know who are Communists and who are not?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say, in the great majority of cases, where politics is made known, and where it is considered whether a man is a Republican, a Democrat, a Socialist, or a Communist, that the Communists are known the same as members of the other parties are known.

The CHAIRMAN. But the question I am asking is this: There is no reason, according to your previous statement, why everyone in the organization, or the majority, should not know who is a Communist and who is not?

Mr. BROWDER. Not the slightest.

The CHAIRMAN. So that if you have Communists who are organizers or officials in a trade-union, there is no reason why the members and other officials of the trade-union should not know that they are Communists, is there?

Mr. BROWDER. No more reason than there is that they should know that they are Democrats or Republicans.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what is the answer to that?

Mr. BROWDER. The answer is, There is no reason.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no reason for that. So that, as a matter of fact—we will take the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O.—there is no reason why the membership of those two organizations and the officials should not know those Communists who are in the organization, is there?

Mr. BROWDER. The only reason that they do not know is because they receive such conflicting advice about the question.

The CHAIRMAN. But you stated that the Communists themselves make no effort to conceal their identity. You say that if they carry on their work, they are bound to find out whether or not they are Communists, by their talk. Now my question is, There is no reason why the membership of those organizations and the officials do not know who are Communists, is there?

Mr. BROWDER. The labels are not important. The important thing is the position the people have.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean there is no reason, in these labor organizations, if the party carries out its duties, why anybody should be deceived as to whether the individual is or is not a Communist?

Mr. BROWDER. There is not.

The CHAIRMAN. If he is a Communist, he is supposed to work at his job, is he not?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And if he works at his job, everybody is supposed to know about it?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And if he is a Communist, those who are around him are bound to find out that he is a Communist?

Mr. BROWDER. And it is a proud title.

The CHAIRMAN. But is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct. What makes that a difficult question to answer, often, in practice, is that there is a tendency to identify every real progressive or militant New Dealer as a Communist, or a "pink," or as Communist inclined, or as a fellow traveler. That confuses the question quite often.

The CHAIRMAN. Your party, as you said a moment ago, has been quite boastful in including certain groups within your influence?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. We even claim credit for the election of the President by saying that we include ourselves in the majority.

Mr. CASEY. Right along that line, Mr. Browder, as I understand your testimony, you stated that in the beginning you set up organizations of your own like this transmission belt.

Mr. BROWDER. No; I did not.

Mr. CASEY. You did not say that?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. CASEY. Did you at some time set up such organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. I said that we participated and helped in setting up small organizations which were not effective in setting up transmission belts, and our plan was to merge them in larger organizations.

Mr. CASEY. One reason you did that was because there were not then in existence organizations that could be used as transmission belts?

Mr. BROWDER. There was no broad progressive movement in question.

Mr. CASEY. At that time were there not in existence the A. F. of L. and the Railroad Brotherhoods?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Did you feel that you were not making any progress through those two organizations with the transmission belt?

Mr. BROWDER. There were many industries in which the workers were trying to organize and improve their conditions, which the A. F. of L. refused to organize. That is why the independent unions sprang up, with our help. When the A. F. of L. became active, we were the first to agree to the proposals to merge them in the A. F. of L.

Mr. VOORHIS. In line with the question that the chairman was asking a minute ago, would it not be more accurate to say that a person familiar with the tactics and programs of the Communist Party would have very little difficulty in knowing what members of the trade-unions were Communists, than it would be that anybody could tell just offhand? I got the impression from the interchange between yourself and the chairman that the idea was that whenever there was a Communist who was a member of a trade union, for example, it was a very easy matter for the leadership of that union to know who he was, and that he was a Communist. My question is, Would it not be more accurate to say that if those leaders were familiar with the policies and tactics and program of the Communist Party, they could tell?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I think that everyone in the labor movement is quite familiar with the point of view and methods of work of the Communists. To the degree that there is any confusion, it is only because there are certain misrepresentations broadcast to try to make people appear as Communists who are not.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; let us proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, you stated a moment ago, I believe, in answer to a question by the chairman, that there was no reason why the identity of a Communist in a labor organization should not be a matter of open knowledge; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There are, however, circumstances under which you consider it quite essential that membership of a person in the Communist Party be strictly secret; is that not true?

Mr. BROWDER. No; that is not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, did you make a speech sometime ago at Union Theological Seminary in New York City?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right. •

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that around the middle of February 1935?

Mr. BROWDER. Approximately.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I ask that this pamphlet be introduced as an exhibit, if Mr. Browder will identify it.

(The pamphlet referred to was handed to the witness.)

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This pamphlet is entitled "Religion and Communism, by Earl Browder," and is a copy of a speech delivered by Mr. Browder at Union Theological Seminary in New York City.

**(The pamphlet referred to was marked "Browder Exhibit No. —," and is filed herewith.)**

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you say, Mr. Browder, to the students at Union Theological Seminary:

You may be interested in knowing that we have preachers, preachers active in churches, who are members of the Communist Party.

Mr. BROWDER. I said that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you think that a congregation of any church in the United States would knowingly retain a clergyman who had membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. I am quite certain of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please give us the names, then, of the clergymen to whom you referred, or some of them, in this statement?

Mr. BROWDER. I will not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is important that they be kept secret, is it?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But there are clergymen active in churches—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). It is very important that they shall not have brought down upon them the spotlight of a national publicity campaign. That certainly would disrupt their congregation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that there are cases where these clergymen are members of the Communist Party, and are known to be such?

Mr. BROWDER. To their own members.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that comprise all denominations?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I would not say all denominations.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, many denominations? It does not include the Catholics, does it?

Mr. BROWDER. At the present time we have not yet got the Catholic clergy in the party.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any Catholics in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, many Catholics.

The CHAIRMAN. You do?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Members of the Communist Party who also belong to the Catholic Church?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And all other denominations?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know that we have all denominations. We have Catholics; we have Methodists; we have Baptists; we have Unitarians; we have Mormons; we have Spiritualists. These are the ones that I have met and know about.

Mr. STARNES. Do you have any Holy Rollers?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe we have a Holy Roller in the south, too.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have members of the Communist Party who are clergymen or preachers in the Methodist Church?

Mr. BROWDER. No; not in the Methodist Church.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the Baptist Church?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe there are Baptists, and Holy Rollers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Baptists and Holy Rollers?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Not the Catholic Church?

Mr. BROWDER. Not the Catholic Church.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Presbyterians?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not certain about the Presbyterians

Mr. MATTHEWS. Congregationalists?

Mr. BROWDER. Not the Congregationalists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Quakers?

Mr. BROWDER. Not the Quakers.

Mr. CASEY. Unitarians?

Mr. BROWDER. No. That is my old church. I have done very little work there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So far as you can remember, they are only in the Baptist Church and in the Holy Roller Church?

Mr. BROWDER. Those are the only ones that I am sure of.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In which there are clergymen who are active preachers and who are members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And is their identity as Communist Party members known to their congregations?

Mr. BROWDER. It is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your book, Mr. Browder, entitled "What Is Communism?" you stated, I believe:

We Communists do not distinguish between good and bad religions, because we think they are all bad for the masses.

That is a statement which you made in this book?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that still your viewpoint?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I think that religions are not playing a very progressive role at this time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do the clergymen who belong to the Communist Party also subscribe to this viewpoint?

Mr. BROWDER. No; they differ with me on that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. They are entitled to differ with the party on that question?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes. We have complete freedom of religious opinion.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Although we did notice this morning that a certain member was expelled for putting religion above his party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. If religion becomes an obstacle to the performance of a member's duties, that is taken into account.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But he can still differ with the party on religion?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say if he does not find it in conflict with the party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, this morning you stated that the relationship between an individual member of the Communist Party and the party was one of free contract, shall we say?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In which the member, if he finds himself in disagreement with the Communist Party, may resign his membership; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, is it not, on the contrary, true that it has always been considered that a man's membership in the Communist Party does not belong to himself, but to the party?

Mr. BROWDER. There has been discussion that has expressed that point of view, but the party did not adopt it, and rejected it, and definitely placed itself on the principle of free association.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are members who find themselves in disagreement with the Communist Party permitted as a rule to resign their membership?

Mr. BROWDER. It depends upon the nature of the dispute.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In most cases has it not been true that such members have been expelled, even though they asked for the permission to resign?

Mr. BROWDER. No; that is not true. We have had, in the year 1938, some 25,000 people pass out of the ranks of the Communist Party. Only a few dozen were expelled. Some 25,000 just severed their connection with the party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would there be a distinction in the matter between the so-called rank and file of the Communist Party and a functionary or a leader? Would you permit a leader of the party to resign because of a disagreement with the party, or would you insist on the procedure of expulsion?

Mr. BROWDER. We have never had a case of a leader of the party wishing voluntarily to resign.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did not Scott Nearing, some years ago, ask for the privilege of resigning from the party?

Mr. BROWDER. That was before I was the secretary. I am not familiar with the details of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you do recall that he requested the privilege of resigning, do you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, I know that Nearing was in and out of the party a number of times.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was expelled, was he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I think once he was expelled, and once he dropped out.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The last time he was expelled; is that not your recollection?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not certain.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In spite of the fact that he remained friendly to the party for years subsequent to the expulsion?

On this matter of a trade-unionist who is a member of the Communist Party being free to let his membership be known openly in his union, do you recall, Mr. Browder, that Lenin wrote a book entitled "Left-Wing Communism: and Infantile Disorder?"

Mr. BROWDER. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that one of the more important documents used by the party in its educational work?

Mr. BROWDER. That is a great book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On page 38 of this book by Lenin—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Let us see if we cannot make these answers more responsive. You are asking him the question as to whether or not that book is considered an important document of the Communist Party; is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. His answer is yes?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. It is a great book. It is considered so by us. I thought that was directly responsive. I am sorry if that was not clear.

The CHAIRMAN. He merely asked you if it was an important document, and of course you can answer that yes or no.

Mr. BROWDER. I thought it was responsive to the question. If it is not, I will try to make it more clear.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is true, is it not, Mr. Browder, that in unions that are led by those opposed to communism, members of the party are in constant danger of expulsion from the unions?

Mr. BROWDER. Where that is true, of course—where Communists are placed under special disabilities and not given their rights on an equality with other political faiths, then, of course, Communists hide their identity.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And they have been under obligation to hide their identity, have they not?

Mr. BROWDER. No. That is entirely a personal question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This discussion here identifies the unions referred to by the naming of the men who are the heads of the various trade-union movements in the world. The first name is that of Gompers; the second is Henderson, referring to Arthur Henderson, of the trade-

union movement in England; Jouhaux, of France; and Legiens, of Belgium. But, at any rate, the American trade-union movement referred to in the discussion here is the American Federation of Labor, inasmuch as Gompers is noted as the head of it. Now, Lenin said:

It is necessary to be able to withstand all this to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate into the trade-unions, to remain in them, and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs.

That quotation does refer, or did refer at the time of its writing, to the American Federation of Labor, did it not?

Mr. BROWDER. It referred to those places where democratic rights were denied.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And this would still be the philosophy of the Communist Party in the trade-unions if Communist trade-union members encountered any opposition in their unions?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I would not say that; oh, no. I would say only that wherever such organizations, in which it is necessary for the workers to belong in order to make their livelihood, and they are in danger of losing their livelihood if they are brought under certain discriminations which are leveled against Communists, and if they have Communist beliefs and yet cannot afford to allow their jobs to be taken away from them, that they should conceal their Communist opinions insofar as it is necessary to continue to make their livelihood and maintain their families.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Should they resort to all sorts of devices in order to stay in the union?

Mr. BROWDER. Whatever is necessary.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All maneuvers and illegal methods, evasion and subterfuge?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not think it is necessary to emphasize that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is the formula laid down by Lenin, however?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In dealing with this question?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say we have not many such examples in America of any such conditions arising, though.

Mr. STARNES. But that was the formula laid down by one of the founders?

Mr. BROWDER. That was the attitude he took at the time when Communists were generally being driven out of labor movements and out of their jobs.

Mr. STARNES. And that was the official attitude of the party, too?

Mr. BROWDER. There was nothing official that was discussed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In keeping with this Communist doctrine of Lenin, should a man, whose job is endangered by any kind of organization, resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, illegal methods, evasion, and subterfuge, in order to keep his job?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not give any general answer to such a question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let us take clergymen who are members of the Communist Party: Are there some of them in the Communist Party whose membership is not known to the congregations which they serve?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As to these Baptist congregations which have Communist clergymen—

Mr. CASEY. Wait a minute. I do not think he said "Communists" plural, of the Baptists. Is there more than one?

Mr. BROWDER. I know one.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know more than one?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not; no.

Mr. STARNES. Then all you can say is there is only one Baptist minister in the United States. How many Holy Rollers do you know?

Mr. BROWDER. One.

Mr. STARNES. So that is the extent of penetration of the Communist Party of this country into the churches; is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. I think their influence extends far more than that.

Mr. STARNES. Is that Baptist minister—can you identify him broadly; is he in the eastern section of the United States, the northern section, or the western section?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say nothing at all that would help to direct any publicity upon a clergyman in a small congregation.

Mr. STARNES. You had no hesitancy a moment ago in saying the Holy Roller minister was in the South, and I wondered why you had any hesitancy in saying whether the Baptist minister was in the South, the North, the East or the West, or what point of the compass, so far as the country is concerned.

Mr. BROWDER. I think when we said "Holy Roller" we did relegate him to the region where that church is to be found.

Mr. CASEY. It is synonymous with the South?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. That is the tenant class, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. The fact of the business is that the minister you had reference to is an organizer?

Mr. BROWDER. No; not an organizer.

Mr. STARNES. He also does organization work in the party?

Mr. BROWDER. He is a Communist.

Mr. STARNES. And also does organization work in the party?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know whether he does any organization work.

Mr. STARNES. Don't you know he does organization work? Let us be fair: don't you know that the primary purpose of that man is he is there as an organizer, rather than a minister?

Mr. BROWDER. Do you know him?

Mr. STARNES. I am asking you the question for information.

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. You don't know that?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know that.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know the section of the country in which this other man is? Certainly it is not a violation of law and there is no reason why it should not be disclosed. I do not want to embarrass you to give the name; if you will give the region, I will appreciate it; otherwise I will have to insist on the name and place, or I am going to ask for action.

Mr. BROWDER. If you consider it very important to know the region, I would say it is in the Middle West.

Mr. STARNES. That is all I want to know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would this formula of concealment and subterfuge apply to the college professor who is on a teaching faculty, where Communist Party membership would not be looked upon with favor?

Mr. BROWDER. I would leave that entirely for the professor himself to decide; I would not try to give any answer for him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are there college professors and teachers in the United States who are members of the Communist Party and whose membership is not a matter of open knowledge?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe not. I don't know of any.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know of any Communist Party members who are teachers but use one name in their teaching profession and another name in their party activity?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't; no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know a man who writes under the name of Jack Hardy, for Communist publications?

Mr. BROWDER. I know of his writings.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether he wrote a book recently entitled "The First American Revolution"?

Mr. BROWDER. I am familiar with that book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And he has written previous books on trade-union situations?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with his other books; I am only familiar with the first one you mentioned.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know what Jack Hardy does? When he is not doing party work, what does he do for a livelihood?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't know he is a school teacher in New York City?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't know whether that is his correct name?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Don't you know it is Dale Zysman?

Mr. BROWDER. I never heard of that before.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you don't know he is a public-school teacher in New York City?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And before that, he has been active in the Communist Party for many years?

Mr. BROWDER. I have been familiar with his writings for several years.

Mr. CASEY. Do you mean Hardy, or Dale Zysman?

Mr. MATTHEWS. My understanding is his correct name is Zysman and that is the name under which he teaches in the public schools of New York, but he does go under the name of Jack Hardy.

Mr. CASEY. Is he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is a member of the Communist Party, is he not?

Mr. BROWDER. Jack Hardy?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know, Mr. Browder, that there are numerous instances of the sort which I have simply illustrated by the case of Jack Hardy?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are not familiar with that?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder yesterday mentioned Granville Hicks as an instructor or fellow who does work as an instructor at Harvard University. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think, however, his contract was not renewed for the present year?

Mr. BROWDER. I understand that. I learned it from the newspaper.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You learned it from the newspaper?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. He is a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a matter of fact, he was ousted from the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, was he not, of New York State, because of his Communist Party membership?

Mr. BROWDER. The institute—no: he was ousted for an entirely different reason, but it was generally suspected he was ousted because of his political beliefs and affiliations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it not correct, Mr. Browder, that Communists distinguish sharply between what they describe as bourgeois morality on the one hand and working-class morality on the other?

Mr. BROWDER. We distinguish quite carefully between the moral precepts of such people as those who ousted Granville Hicks for being a Communist and said it was for some other reason, and the morality which would protect workers, whether in factories or in colleges, in the tenure of their work without regard to their political beliefs.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. That is, we sharply distinguish between those so-called morals which can be directed to taking people out of their livelihood, and the morals which would protect the livelihood of the people. If that is what you mean, yes.

Mr. CASEY. That is, you believe if a college ousts a man because he is a Communist, they ought to have the courage to give the reason?

Mr. BROWDER. They ought to have the courage to say so.

Mr. STARNES. Don't you think a man who is a professor in a college and a Communist ought to have the courage to say so?

Mr. BROWDER. Sometimes he may be forced to adopt the morality of those who run the college. [Laughter.]

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, is it true that Communist morality is subordinated to the interests of the class struggle?

Mr. BROWDER. We don't have such a thing as Communist morality. [Laughter.]

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, you are familiar, of course, with the speech which Lenin made to the youth of Russia some years ago?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. He was speaking in a country where Communists already represented the great majority of the people, and when he speaks of "Communist morality" he is speaking of the morality of the majority of the people. The Communists are a very small group in the country. They have no special morality separate from the morality of the great mass of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; that answers the question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said, Mr. Browder, there was no such thing as Communist morality; Lenin did use the phrase "Communist morality," did he not?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So that there was such a thing, according to Lenin?

Mr. BROWDER. There is in the Soviet Government. Communists have morals, of course; I don't want you to think, when I say there is no Communist morality, that we reject ethical codes. We certainly have an ethical code, but it is not peculiar to us.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Lenin said, on page 13 of this pamphlet:

We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. Our morality is deduced from the class struggle of the proletariat.

That is the view of Lenin on the use of morality. Lenin did speak of Communist morality, did he not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that is the view which is held by Communist Parties of the world today?

Mr. BROWDER. It is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does that mean that any act which might jeopardize the interests of the proletariat would be considered an immoral act?

Mr. BROWDER. Anything that would injure the interests of the majority of the people is considered immoral.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And anything which might advance the interests of the proletariat would be considered within the bounds of Communist morality?

Mr. BROWDER. Anything that would advance the interests of a majority of the people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, the plain language there, "Morality is subordinated entirely to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat," means that whatever advances the cause for which the Communists stand is good, and whatever does not advance that cause is bad: is not that the simple truth of the matter?

Mr. BROWDER. Not in that form. You are trying to reduce it to a statement that we have no moral code. No; I cannot follow you in that line of reasoning whatever.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I am trying to understand the code which you do follow.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; you are expressing a very well-known misunderstanding.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how he can read such a construction and I think the witness should answer these questions clearly and unequivocally, if he knows. If he does not—

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I was answering clearly and unequivocally. I do not accept the implications of the question; I disagree with that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then let us let the language speak for itself in the quotation.

Mr. STARNES. I think this witness, and all other witnesses, when a question is fairly put to the witness where there can be no misunderstanding about it, should be required to answer respectfully when

a question is addressed to them respectfully, and I think we should insist upon this witness giving unequivocal answers to questions of that type and character.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, he is being questioned with regard to the statements of someone else and not with regard to his own statements, and he is being asked to interpret the statements, and it seems to me that some explanation would be in order, rather than a "yes" or "no" proposition. I mean to make it as responsive as possible, but the Chair does believe where questions of policy or morality are asked, or dealing with those matters, that it is often difficult to give a "yes" or "no" answer, and some explanation ought to be accorded the witness, in fairness.

Mr. STARNES. Certainly, and I do not want him to be shut off from explaining anything of that character; but when he is asked the question as to whether—to define or explain what that means, he ought to define or explain it.

Mr. BROWDER. May I explain?

Mr. MASON. I just want to inject this thought: That when a witness is asked to place an interpretation upon some other person's words, he is entitled to place the interpretation that he thinks or believes those words mean.

Mr. STARNES. Certainly.

Mr. MASON. That may not be the interpretation that the great majority of people would place upon them, but he certainly is entitled to it, and I think the witness, in this particular case, did attempt to give his interpretation—which I do not accept and which maybe others do not accept; but that is all he can give, is his interpretation of it.

I think you are right, Mr. Chairman, in the attitude you express.

Mr. STARNES. As I understood him, instead of answering the question, he charged the man asking the question with putting certain implications upon it. That is what I had objected to.

Mr. MASON. I did not hear it that way.

Mr. STARNES. That he charged Mr. Matthews with certain implications in asking the question. And if there is any doubt about it, let the reporter read it.

Mr. CASEY. Let us go along.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, you stated a while ago that shop papers had been discontinued prior to the tenth convention.

Mr. BROWDER. I believe it was just before the tenth convention.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you consider the paper published by the Communist unit of the New York Times, formerly known as Better Times and more recently known as High Time, to be a shop paper?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know whether that was one of our shop papers, or not. I assume it was, I have no direct information.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I beg your pardon: that was New Time, instead of High Time.

That publication, though, is still being printed, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not, to my knowledge and belief.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was, within the last 2 or 3 months, though?

Mr. BROWDER. I think not. I would say if it is being published, it is against the decision of the Communist Party, if it purports to be a Communist organ.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It does so purport, does it not, on the masthead, "Published by the Communist Party Unit of the New York Times"?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know; I am not familiar with it; I can only answer hypothetically. You said it did appear; I said if it did, it was in violation of the decision of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with the shop paper published by the Communist Party unit in Time magazine, known as High Time?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have not seen anything of it?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know that has also been published within the period of the last year, or in the period of the last 6 months?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know that?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You stated this morning, Mr. Browder, that some years ago the Trade Union Unity League was disbanded and the unions which composed that league were dissolved and the members went into the American Federation of Labor. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is not the precise way in which I formulated it. I said the unions were merged into the A. F. of L.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. The manner in which the merger took place was they withdrew according to case. Sometimes there was acceptance en bloc; sometimes there was dissolution and individual entering.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Can you give one instance where there was a merger between the unions of the Trade Union Unity League, and the corresponding union of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. BROWDER. Various metal workers' unions entered the machinists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who is Jack Stachel?

The CHAIRMAN. If I may interrupt you, I want to see if I understand that. You have about 75,000 members of the Communist Party who are now identified with the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O.?

Mr. BROWDER. Not so many as that.

The CHAIRMAN. How many?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say it is about between 40 and 50 thousand.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are members of those two unions, and the membership in the C. I. O. is 2 to 1; 2 for every 1 of the A. F. of L.?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. So that there would be, approximately, if there are 50,000 altogether—what would the proportion be?

Mr. MATTHEWS. About thirty-three and a third thousand.

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-three and some odd to thirteen; is that right?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Thirty-three to seventeen?

Mr. BROWDER. Approximately.

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. I am not brushed up on my mathematics right now.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It would be  $33\frac{1}{3}$  and 16%.

Mr. Browder, who is Jack Stachel?

Mr. BROWDER. Executive secretary of the national committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is his relationship to the trade-union work of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. No special relationship now, except as all Communists are interested in it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he once have a special designation with reference to the trade-union work of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. He used to give special attention to trade-union questions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Reading from *The Communist*, dated November 1934, from an article entitled "Our Trade-Union Policy," by Jack Stachel, I read, on page 1105:

The Greens will, of course, continue to resort to expulsions, but if we work cleverly they will not succeed in isolating us.

Do you recall that article, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't recall that particular one. I do not question it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was a report to the political bureau of the central committee of the Communist Party, made by Jack Stachel in 1934, at the time of the dissolution of the unions of the Trade Union Unity League?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Could you tell us precisely what Mr. Stachel means by "working cleverly" so that the Greens will not be able to isolate us in the A. F. of L. unions?

Mr. BROWDER. I think it means avoiding such—all controversies on any issues which would not have the support of the majority of the members. It was warning the trade unionists that by getting into controversies on issues which are not popular they will isolate themselves among those masses.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, if they spoke too boldly of the Communist Party line in the unions, they would by that fact be isolated and identified as Communists?

Mr. BROWDER. That they should not attempt to propagandize the Communist Party before a crowd which, in its great majority, was non-Communist, and even anti-Communist.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is in accordance, I believe, with the theories expressed by Karl Marx in advising the Communist movement of Europe, in the last century, to gage its language to the ability of masses of workers to accept the language, and not to be overbold where the masses were afraid of such revolutionary words as "dictatorship," and so on? You are not familiar with that?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with the quotation of which you speak, but I would express the same general idea in my own language by saying it is the part of wisdom for every political leader and every political worker to adjust the terms of his message to the life and experience of those to whom he is speaking.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, the party may believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat, but for a period of years say nothing about that dictatorship, in order to adjust its language to the masses it is addressing; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is, if there is such a term as "dictatorship of the proletariat"; but if this term has been misrepresented to mean its opposite, then those who want to transmit that idea should

not use a term which has already come to mean the opposite of what its hearers think it means. And I would say, speaking for myself, I would not, in alluding to the political theory, refer to the "dictatorship of the proletariat"; I would never get up before a general audience and speak about the "dictatorship of the proletariat," because not only would they not understand me, but they would understand the opposite of what I want to say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it not true, Mr. Browder, there has been a sharp change in the policy or tactics of the Communist Party on this question of the use of certain phrases, such as "dictatorship of the proletariat," in recent years?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that over the years there has been a great change; that we used to repeat phrases out of books, and now we try to get phrases from the masses of the people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a matter of fact, in recent years the use of the phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" has appeared rarely, or not at all, in the columns of the Daily Worker?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And formerly it was found in those columns rather frequently?

Mr. BROWDER. It is quite possible it was very frequently used, because there was a serious effort to popularize the paper in past years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But the party and this Daily Worker still believe as strongly as ever in the dictatorship of the proletariat, according to their interpretation of the phrase?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I would say those who believe in that get their understanding out of books and not out of the papers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I did not refer to anything in the paper; I say they still believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat, as they understand it, despite the fact they no longer speak of it?

Mr. BROWDER. Among party members it is referred to, but not in the constitution.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is there anything about the dictatorship of the proletariat in the party's constitution today?

Mr. BROWDER. That phrase is not used.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is not there at all?

Mr. BROWDER. No; it is not there at all.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is this your final document in the rewriting of the constitution which the Communist Party has published?

Mr. BROWDER. It is the first such document ever published by the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, you have not had a constitution prior to this?

Mr. BROWDER. There was one adopted at the sixth convention, but it was purely a formality and the thing was lost and never printed and was not in effect.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are not there many other phrases, such as "dictatorship of the proletariat," which have also been dropped from Communist writing at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. We try either to clarify or drop every expression which will not convey our precise idea to the broadest masses of the people.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you speak frequently today of the overthrow of capitalism in your publications—at all comparable to the frequency with which it appeared in former years?

Mr. BROWDER. No; we don't.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Or of the establishment of a workers' and farmers' government of the United States, to supplant the present capitalistic state?

Mr. BROWDER. We more often speak of the workers' and farmers' government of the United States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has not there, as a matter of fact, Mr. Browder, been what we might describe as a "blackout" of the Communist terminology, with a view deliberately to conceal the vulnerable points in the Communist ideology, so that the American people will not be able to attack the Communist citadel?

Mr. BROWDER. No; that is not true, and, aside from what I have already explained, the main motive of our carefulness in the choice of language is to sharply distinguish ourselves from those circles in America which, even expressing themselves in the daily newspapers today, use every revolutionary-sounding talk and phrases, which we want to have nothing to do with at all. I refer to such people as Father Coughlin, who speaks about bullets to overthrow the American Government. I speak about such things where in a recent newspaper, a daily paper, I saw he suggested the assassination of the President. And we carefully choose our language to separate ourselves from all such societies in America. We have nothing to do with them; we fight against them.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you are becoming the conservative party of America, and they are the radicals? [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWDER. In that sense, we are becoming more and more conservative.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, Mr. Browder, let us see if we have that clear; instead of those phrases which were formerly used with great frequency, is it not true that today you use the word "democratic" a great deal?

Mr. BROWDER. No; we have always used the word "democratic."

Mr. MATTHEWS. But have you not, in the use of that phrase in the past, or during the last few years, been careful to draw a distinction between bourgeois democracy, so-called, and proletarian democracy?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes; and we still do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you still do that?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You still do that?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you speak in all your publications about the proletarian democracy?

Mr. BROWDER. We speak for the defense of the principles of democracy as a defense against that which is threatened throughout the world now. If we speak about it more, it is because the danger is more.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you ever qualify the word "democracy," by calling it proletarian democracy?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; we want to defend democracy everywhere.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You want to defend bourgeois democracy?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Even though it suppresses the working class?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not defend suppression. I defend democracy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you not in the past frequently call bourgeois democracy an instrument of suppression for the working class?

Mr. BROWDER. If that was said—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). It was said.

Mr. BROWDER. It may have been. I do not deny it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it not true that the use of the word "democracy" without the front words "bourgeois" or "proletarian" leads to unclarity or misunderstanding from the standpoint of Communist doctrine?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; I think it clarifies the situation considerably.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were a delegate to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in 1935, were you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you reported to the congress on the situation in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I show you a photostatic copy of the Daily Worker of July 29, 1935, pages 1, 2, 3, and 5. Do you recognize this?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; it seems to be authentic.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On the third page of the Daily Worker of July 29, 1935, we find the headline "United front the first step to revolution." That is a correct description of the united front, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; I think that is a very stupid headline, and it is not taken out of my speech.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say it was a stupid headline?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Even if the Comintern recommends headlines for the Daily Worker, you say it was a stupid mistake?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Comintern does exercise considerable scrutiny over the headlines of the Daily Worker, does it not?

Mr. BROWDER. They have examined them sometimes in a limited way. I am very critical myself of headlines when placed over my speeches.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In your book, Communism in the United States, you described the united front as a "lever to win the masses." Do you consider the power of the State—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). I would say that the whole question of the relation between the immediate demand for social revolution is one that cannot be dealt with in headlines, but only in serious discussion.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You still think that the united front is the lever to win the masses?

Mr. BROWDER. Such a phrase has very little meaning to me taken out of its context.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is the headline on this page and must be in the text.

Mr. BROWDER. Except for the discussion that follows.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You say it is a stupid headline?

Mr. BROWDER. They sometimes make stupid headlines.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say it was stupid in the light of the present policy?

Mr. BROWDER. Everything that tends to distort the position of the party is stupid. They should be intelligent and expose the distortions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please identify M. Jenks for the committee? Do you know that name?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with that book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know the man?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You never heard of the man?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You never heard of him?

Mr. BROWDER. I knew very little about it. I have never read the book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am talking about Jenks.

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; I do not know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have not heard of him?

Mr. BROWDER. I have heard the name.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know his relation to any Communist body?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know whether Jenks belonged to the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. I never heard of it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you give the names of some of the delegates from the Comintern to the American Party? Are you familiar with the name of John Pepper?

Mr. BROWDER. It is quite familiar, but not as a delegate from the Comintern.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was John Pepper his real name?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not sure.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it Joseph Pogany?

Mr. BROWDER. I never heard of that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did he use "Schwartz" as an alias?

Mr. BROWDER. I have heard of Schwartz.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you recognize a picture of John Pepper?

Mr. BROWDER. I certainly would. I believe that is he [indicating a picture].

Mr. MATTHEWS. The picture is marked in evidence. This is a picture of Joseph Pogany, alias Schwartz, and identified as John Pepper. Now, you say that you did not know that John Pepper was a delegate from the Comintern to the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he an American?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he was an American.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he a naturalized citizen?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is he now?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did not the Communist International demand the return of Pepper to Moscow on two occasions?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he was requested to come to Moscow.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he not called twice, and did they have some trouble in getting him back?

Mr. BROWDER. There was a great deal of trouble, not in getting him back, but in getting him there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In getting him to return?

Mr. BROWDER. In getting him out of the United States.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know who Gussev was?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; I am acquainted with him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was he a delegate from the Comintern to the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have there ever been delegates from the Comintern to the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Harry Pollitt was a delegate.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who else besides Harry Pollitt?

Mr. BROWDER. I think he is the only one representative authorized to speak for the C. I.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, it is your recollection that Harry Pollitt, to your knowledge, was the only authorized representative from the Comintern to the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You ought to know.

Mr. BROWDER. I cannot answer for everything that has taken place.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That would be an important place, would it not?

Mr. BROWDER. I am telling you what I know. That is the most I can do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would it not be an important position to occupy, that of delegate from the Comintern to the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. His function would be to see that the policies of the Comintern were carried out here?

Mr. BROWDER. His function would be, in the light of his experience, to do—

Mr. MATTHEWS (interposing). Who is the Comintern delegate to the United States at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. There has been no Comintern delegate since Harry Pollitt was here.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall when he was here?

Mr. BROWDER. In 1929.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There has been none in the last 10 years?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. There are some questions I will ask while Mr. Matthews is looking up something. I believe you said that the party had about 7,000 members in 1929?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And it grew to about 30,000 or 35,000 in 1934, and then from 1934 to 1939 it jumped to 100,000, so that your greatest growth has been from 1934 to 1939?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the greatest growth in the history of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe that you also stated that from 1934 to 1939 there have been put into effect more humanitarian measures than in our entire history before?

Mr. BROWDER. To be more precise, I would say from 1935.

The CHAIRMAN. From 1935 you have seen more sympathy on the part of the authorities for the relief of distress and unemployment than ever before?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; we consider that the measures proposed and approved have more relation to that end and therefore should be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. You consider that we have gone further in that direction than ever before?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that Congress in that period had gone the longest way or taken the greatest step in the direction of humanitarian legislation than any Congress had in the past?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; to put it in the language of the street, for the first time in our experience we have seen a more sincere effort to carry out after the election promises made before the election.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no quarrel with our Government's plan of administering those measures?

Mr. BROWDER. We have had many good measures, and we have supported those projects.

The CHAIRMAN. But it has not gone as far as you wanted it to go, but to the extent that it has gone you have been in accord with it?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, it is a step in the right direction?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; in the right direction.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think that Congress has done practically everything that it could do, within our constitutional limitations, to help the masses of the people?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that much more could have been done.

The CHAIRMAN. But under the circumstances that existed, with our capitalistic system and constitutional limitations, do you not think it has done about everything that could be done in that direction?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; I think that a great deal more could have been done even under a capitalistic system. I do not think we have hardly touched the surface of what can be done to improve the economic condition of the people, even under capitalism.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you admit that in no other equal period of time in the history of the country have we gone so far in the direction of benefiting the masses as we have gone during this period from 1935 to 1939?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; at no time in the past have we done so.

The CHAIRMAN. No other time in our history has been equal to this period in that respect?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Yet, during this time in which we have enacted so many of such measures, and have gone so far in that direction, your party has made its greatest growth in numbers.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the explanation of that to those who say that Marxism or communism thrives on distress, unemployment, and so forth? What is the explanation of it, when we consider that during this period of your greatest growth, the Government has put into effect social legislation aiming to further economic security?

During that period it has enacted all that social legislation, yet during the same period your party has had a greater growth than ever before.

Mr. BROWDER. It is a very good and a very interesting question, and I will try to give a very brief and clear answer. I think the explanation of that is to be found in this fact, that our party learned how to enable people who want socialism to express their desires for a Socialist system, thereby placing them in a position to immediately improve their condition. We found out how to combine that.

The CHAIRMAN. Making it practical?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. To advocate something that does not exist, we start with something that does exist.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you reached the conclusion that socialism can never be achieved by any sudden movement, that it would be improbable that if conditions ever became very chaotic in this country, it would enable communism to come into power?

Mr. BROWDER. That is not an unfair formulation.

The CHAIRMAN. You realize that the more clever strategy would be to go along with socialistic economic measures, even if they are incomplete—that it would be better to go along with socialistic measures and do gradually what it is impossible to do suddenly?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, of course, if you really want to know what I have in mind, you must draw a finer distinction than that, because those measures we are supporting now I do not conceive to be socialistic in their tendency. I would say that they tend to strengthen capitalism. They strengthen the capitalistic system. We support them, not because they strengthen the capitalistic system, because we want to improve the condition of the workers.

The CHAIRMAN. But because you support them, you increase your popularity with the masses?

Mr. BROWDER. We help to improve the condition of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, by joining in with a popular move, you increase the prestige and influence of your own party.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. Of course, you cannot build up a movement in America today that does not have a realistic hold on the people.

The CHAIRMAN. You admit that there has been a radical change in your party strategy and tactics?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the same change that has occurred in every other country where the Communist Party existed?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you arrived at that change in a conference in the Comintern?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; we exchange our experiences, and find out what is taking place everywhere, and by making it a conscious uniform practice, we make it deeper and more effective.

The CHAIRMAN. So far as the chief, primary, and ultimate purposes of socialism are concerned, do you admit that chaotic conditions in the country are more favorable than prosperous conditions?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, your recent experience has indicated to you very clearly that an appeal to intelligence is more effective than an appeal to distress and poverty?

Mr. BROWDER. Distress in itself does not produce results. It is only when it is combined with intelligent planning and a program.

The CHAIRMAN. That has been subsequent to the change.

Mr. BROWDER. We have learned that only in the last few years.

The CHAIRMAN. What happened in Russia was due to terrible poverty.

Mr. BROWDER. It was on the way to a break-down.

The CHAIRMAN. But for that, one and a half million members of the party could not have seized control of the Russian Government?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That was also the experience until it began to expand to other countries?

Mr. BROWDER. That has been the experience of liberal movements everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. By an evolutionary process, in its forward march over into England and into other countries, they found that they would make better progress by a radical change in their tactics and policies, or from the tactics and policies which prevailed during the Russian revolution.

Mr. BROWDER. That is not an unfair statement, but it is not the way I would put it.

The CHAIRMAN. The average member of your party who is trained for trade-union activities receives far greater training than the average member of a trade-union movement, does he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that is usually the case.

The CHAIRMAN. Through all your writings you stress work among the workers.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. So that a man who goes into the trade-union movement from your party is really efficient in the art, you might say, of agitation, education, or enlightenment, as I think they put it.

Mr. BROWDER. We would not want him to speak for communism if he was not efficient, because if he is inefficient he would discredit our views.

The CHAIRMAN. He is trained and qualified for that work?

Mr. BROWDER. We try to bring that about.

The CHAIRMAN. You try to bring that about?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; as much as we can.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that account for the fact that so many of your members succeed in becoming efficient organizers?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that is the reason. If Communists are elected to office in trade-unions, it is not because those who elect them want to support communism but it is because they choose what they consider to be the most effective trade-union organizer.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, on the basis of experience and ability?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what has happened in the mass industries of the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They were lacking in organizers?

Mr. BROWDER. As long as they had good jobs, they were entirely willing—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Is it not a fact that in the automobile industry, the steel industry, and the other heavy mass industries, be-

ginning about 1935, your party members were much more efficient in building up the unions than was the ordinary trade-union organizer?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. Of course, there were other very efficient organizers.

The CHAIRMAN. But, on the whole, that is true?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. Taking our organizers as a whole group, you would find more trained organizers among Communist members than in other groups.

The CHAIRMAN. And that accounts for their success?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of Marxism in connection with nazi-ism and national socialism. Do you see anything socialistic in nazi-ism?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; it is the very repudiation of human reason, whereas Marxism is the elevation of human reason to a higher level.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you studied the program of the Workers Party in Germany, or the Workers Party of the Nazi group? Have you studied their first program?

Mr. BROWDER. I have seen the documents.

The CHAIRMAN. Their appeals were to the workers. Hitler's appeal was to workers.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. He has said time and time again that he could not make any progress with the middle classes or upper classes. Did he not say that his greatest success was in his appeal to the workers? Is it not a fact that Hitler enunciated a social program of economic security or insurance, and made promises of that sort to get power?

Mr. BROWDER. He used certain slogans and promises, but there was no program.

The CHAIRMAN. He advocated certain socialistic measures?

Mr. BROWDER. Not clearly defined socialistic measures.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that the program he outlined in the first instance, or his first enunciation of principles for the Workers Party was not socialism?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You think it was capitalistic?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not recognize that in Germany private owners merely hold a paper title to property, and that the State directs all enterprises?

Mr. BROWDER. The State does, but the owners are the big capitalists. When you speak of private property disappearing, it means that they are taking the property of small property owners.

The CHAIRMAN. The State direct the business enterprises of the country.

Mr. BROWDER. There is nothing socialistic in that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it a fact that the State directs all those enterprises, or all private business enterprises, in Germany?

Mr. BROWDER. The State authority is supreme.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that their law specifically provides that the State reserves the right to confiscate property at any time without due process of law?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; I did not know that. Of course, every government retains that right.

The CHAIRMAN. But not without due process of law.

Mr. BROWDER. Every government has its own due process.

The CHAIRMAN. The point I am making is that under Fascist and Nazi regimes, for all practical purposes, the owners of private property do not control their property, but the control passes to the State.

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; I would say that the small owners lose their property, and that it passes into the hands of the big capitalists.

The CHAIRMAN. But whether it is monopolistic control, or State and monopolistic control, the State does control the business enterprises?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; but if the property is controlled by monopolists, I say that what is going on there is not socialism, but it is a kind of economic system of the country that concentrates property into the hands of a small group, or a shrinking group of monopolists and capitalists.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Browder, first of all, I would like to ask you this question: You have spoken about world conditions and the United States. You have said that you believe that the United States should do, and I think that it certainly wants to do, what it can to defend democracy in the real sense of that word to prevent dictatorships. Is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. VOORHIS. Do you feel that at least one type of dictatorship that should be combatted from that point of view is nazi-ism or fascism?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. VOORHIS. That would be the point of view from which you would judge the action of the United States and its effectiveness in carrying on that work?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. VOORHIS. Do you believe that it was helpful to that work for Germany to be relieved of the necessity of looking to her eastern border?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; I do not. I think it would be much better if Chamberlain had formed the peace front which the Soviet Union urged, but which he broke up.

Mr. VOORHIS. Is it not true that the Communist Party of France, for example, is going to the front and supporting the Government without the help of the Soviet Union in any respect?

Mr. BROWDER. That is not true, without the help of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union can only give help outside of its borders by agreement. It has helped the United States.

Mr. VOORHIS. Let us see what you mean by saying that the pact between Germany and Russia has strengthened the position of the United States. Will you explain that?

Mr. BROWDER. I will try to explain that. I can do it in a logical way, or by the way in which events have developed, which shows the true situation. The true state of the events is shown by an examination of the results of this pact. Its announcement was followed by world events, and the greatest dismay that was created by this pact was in Tokyo. Shortly after that the Tokyo cabinet resigned and a new cabinet came in, which, in the first hour, began to broadcast messages of peace to the American people.

Mr. VOORHIS. But, Mr. Browder, if I may interrupt, in the last couple of days we have had dispatches that negotiations were in progress between the Soviet Government and Japan, and also dispatches to the effect that Japan had told the British and the French that they should withdraw their troops from the Far East voluntarily. I do not know about those dispatches, but I have read them.

Mr. BROWDER. It is a significant fact that the Soviet Union was prepared to make a pact with Japan, but Japan has always refused to sign it. If there is something new that comes from Japan, if Japan is ready to sign such a pact, it means that Japan is in a very desperate situation and is convinced that it can only save itself by adopting that policy.

Mr. VOORHIS. How does that help the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. It would obviously help them by breaking the axis. First of all, the result of the pact was that it broke the axis.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that Japan has been replaced by Stalin?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I do not mean that.

Mr. VOORHIS. Surely you cannot say that signing of this pact was a blow to fascism in Europe?

Mr. BROWDER. So far as Europe is concerned, I think it has been made clear—

Mr. VOORHIS. Is it not perfectly clear that the signing of that pact made it possible for Mr. Hitler to go ahead?

Mr. BROWDER. No; that is not true.

Mr. VOORHIS. I cannot quite understand why that should not be true, on the one hand, and why, on the other hand, the Communists of France and England should support and cooperate with the efforts of their government to enter this war. It does not seem to me that it makes sense.

Mr. BROWDER. I will be glad to explain it. The Communists of the United States, of France, and of England consistently advocated the getting together of their governments, together with the Soviet Union, or as many as could be brought together, to form a compact to resist aggression, whoever might be the aggressor. They supported the smaller powers threatened by aggression. Were we taking a different stand, in principle, from the Communists of the Soviet Union? No; over there the Communists control the government and are responsible for the course of the government. They took the same stand because their government has offered its cooperation for the same purpose. The Soviet Union went much further in being prepared to throw its strength into world strength against aggression. It was prepared to make such a pact against aggression.

But when they found that Chamberlain and those that influenced affairs in the small countries refused to agree to any kind of a pact which would allow the Soviet Union, if at war with Germany, to conduct the war effectively, then it became clear that they wanted only to have the Soviet Union technically at war, without any freedom of action, but themselves free to turn German aggression against the Soviet Union.

Therefore, the Soviet Union, in the interest of stopping this whole drifting into war and this conspiracy of hiding the realities of the situation, had to demonstrate before the world that it was not bound by any compact to go to war. It was in the same position as the

United States, except that the world had been led to believe that they were compelled to go to war when they were not.

Mr. Voorhis. But the plain matter of fact is that their action did not stop the war, and it seems to me evident that the negotiations between the Soviet Union and Germany could not have been undertaken on the spur of the moment, but must have been in progress over the same period of time when negotiations between the Soviet Government, England, and France were in progress.

Mr. BROWDER. That is a question we can only speculate on.

The CHAIRMAN. In that connection, suppose I was threatening to jump on my friend, Mr. Voorhis.

Mr. BROWDER. I am sure you would not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course not, but just as an illustration, assume that he is a small man and I am a powerful man, and you are supposed to be a friend to Mr. Voorhis.

Mr. BROWDER. He would deny that.

The CHAIRMAN. Assuming that to be true, and I should doubt it, and you know I am going to jump on him, and you have been all the time pretending to be his friend.

Then you and I, let us assume, go off in a corner and make an agreement under which I would jump on Mr. Voorhis, and you say, "I will not take any part in it; I will just stand on the side." You would say, "I have told him I am also his friend and am against aggression."

Mr. BROWDER. To complete that picture—

The CHAIRMAN. You say, "I am not going to get in this myself, but if you want some club, I will give you a club to knock Voorhis in the head, and if you get hurt I will get you busy. If you put him under, I am for it."

Under those circumstances, what about the agreement that is between you and me?

Mr. BROWDER. As I look at the picture, I would like to draw a few strokes myself. I would suggest, as the supposed threat on Mr. Voorhis, you are both attacked by a big brute and you want my help. Mr. Voorhis says, "No; I do not want to have anything to do with wars." Then I suspect that the fight between you and him was perhaps prearranged as something to begin to prepare to attack me.

The CHAIRMAN. You think this thing is all agreed to?

Mr. BROWDER. Such things have been known to happen in history.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe probably that is true?

Mr. BROWDER. So, in the circumstances, what do I do? Shall I retire? I have no choice but to be neutral; and if it is a question of continuing to do business, I will do business with both of you.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you say that as far as the Communist Party is concerned you are yourself defending democracy, no matter whether it is proletarian democracy or not?

Mr. BROWDER. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. Still you defend the Soviet Union in being at least conservative, according to that statement, as more conservative minded at the moment than other nations?

Mr. BROWDER. No; the Soviet Union is exactly in the same legal judicial relation to all powers that the United States is.

Mr. STARNES. The United States has not agreed not to fight Germany.

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes; it has.

Mr. STARNES. It has not agreed not to join any combination of powers opposing Germany.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; it has. The United States has declared it would not fight Germany and will not join any combination against Germany.

Mr. VOORHIS. Is it not true that the Soviet Union is pursuing a policy to its own interest. I am not saying that they should not do that, but they have pursued a policy purely in the interest of the Soviet Union.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS. At the same time the United States has been urged by the Communist Party to take a stand against the policy of looking out for American interests.

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, no.

Mr. VOORHIS. Maybe I am stating it not quite fairly, but I can say this: It has been urged to enter into a policy of collective security, so-called, with other nations in the world, and to make that the primary feature of American foreign policy.

Mr. BROWDER. Not abandoning the defense of American interests, and if you will read my book, Fighting for Peace, you will find that it contains a complete elaboration of our proposals, and you will find we never have ceased to place emphasis upon the defense of American national interests or saying that America should go into joint efforts to organize the peace of the world only on the basis of defending American interests.

Mr. CASEY. I notice on page 21 of your book, Fighting for Peace, you say:

It is my conviction that the Fascist dictatorships can be halted only by superior force.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. CASEY. Russia has not added its superior force?

Mr. BROWDER. They offered it, but it was refused.

Mr. CASEY. To whom?

Mr. BROWDER. To England, France, and Poland.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean they offered to help Poland?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And Poland refused because to have Poland agree would have been a farce.

Mr. BROWDER. I did not say anything of the kind. I say I suspect there is an understanding between Chamberlain and Hitler as to how this is coming out.

Mr. CASEY. In reference to the policy of Chamberlain—I have in mind that you said Russia was considering her own interests—in this book, on page 35, you say that—

In the same breath, they proceed to "prove" by the British example that the only correct course for the United States is one closely copied after that of Chamberlain—that is, to hell with the rest of the world, make our own arrangements, and above all, keep out of the way of the bandit nations, the Fascist aggressors, and speak softly to them.

At any rate, that is just the policy that Russia has adopted, do you not agree?

Mr. BROWDER. No: I say up to the very last minute, up until the time when it became clear that in a few days war would break out,

the Soviet Union was still trying to bring about a pact between nations that were threatened, which was refused, and only then were they forced, in order not to sacrifice the interests of a nation of 170,000,000 people, to agree with Germany that neither would attack the other, that is, to prevent the war spreading to Soviet territory, when the Soviet nation has no agreement with any other power in connection with that matter.

Mr. WHITLEY. How do you know they did not have such an agreement?

Mr. BROWDER. I think I can speak of it as a matter of public knowledge. I have no knowledge of these things except as they are matters of public record.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is just your opinion?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I think there is such a thing as a public record.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the public record in this instance, their own statement?

Mr. BROWDER. The public record is the public relations between the public and the Government, statements of officials. I am entitled to express an opinion based on this public record.

Mr. CASEY. On page 44 of your book Fighting for Peace you say:

It is the height of futility, and that means, in the last analysis, of stupidity, to try to follow a domestic policy of a progressive, democratic, and peaceful character, and at the same time in foreign affairs to be "neutral" as between Fascist and democratic, between war-making and peace-seeking governments, to retreat before and surrender to the bandit governments.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. CASEY. Assuming that the nonaggression pact with Germany by Russia is not a big thing, do you not agree that it is a surrender to little things?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not. I say it is a big thing, and not a surrender. It was a very big concession by Hitler. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWDER. Those who want to laugh at this statement are entitled to laugh, if you want to do so. It is not merely the opinion of the Communist Party; it is the opinion, the composite opinion, expressed by the Communist Party, and also the opinion expressed by a minister of His Majesty's Government, Anthony Eden, before he was taken into the Cabinet again.

This view was expressed by many other very conservative public men; and I think, if I may, continuing my answer, I think by many public officials in Washington. Take as an example the city of Washington, if you want to get a majority of all the different opinions about this pact, and measure it from this point of view, and compare the reaction of those closest to the making of decisions on foreign policy for the United States with the reaction of those furthest removed from the formation of foreign policy, those furthest removed will say that this was a bad thing to do from the angle of what they wanted the United States to do in the world situation. But they agree that if the pact was a good thing for Russia and for America, in the long run it would be a good thing for the world.

Mr. THOMAS. Who are you referring to now?

Mr. CASEY. I have just one more question.

Why is the Russian pact with Germany a good thing for the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. Because it broke the axis, it relieved the pressure on American interests in the Far East. It dissolved the threat of fascism

through Spain, to penetrate to Latin America and threaten American interests there. It dissolved the threat to the Monroe Doctrine.

Two weeks ago Dorothy Thompson, a very conservative writer, wrote in her column that if America continues to drift along in a very short time there will be no "open door;" there will be no Monroe Doctrine, and there will be no Europe.

Today nobody may write like that. Everybody sees the "open door" opening again, everybody sees trade to Latin America lifting, and that came directly after the conclusion of the Soviet-German non-aggression pact. By breaking the axis the Soviet Union broke the most direct threat to America.

Mr. VOORHIS. If you say there was no act of friendship between Germany and Russia in this pact, why should it have broken the axis? Is there not an implication in what you said that Germany sacrificed all her close ties that she had?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not say this was not an act of friendship with Germany. It most certainly was an act of friendship between the German and Russian people, and we have to distinguish between friendship between peoples and alliances between governments. It was an act of friendship between these peoples and in no way an alliance between governments.

Mr. THOMAS. Just a few moments ago you referred to some individuals who were closest to the picture and you said you were making a comparison between those in Washington closet to the picture and others who were farthest away from the picture. Who were you referring to as being closet to the picture and who would think that was a good pact?

Mr. BROWDER. I was merely suggesting to you a method of putting to the test this question. I have no personal acquaintance with any of the people who handle these questions.

Mr. THOMAS. You did not have any one particularly in mind?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Here is another question I want to ask you, which has to do with the testimony you gave this afternoon.

You were referring to the utilization of transmission belts, and I inferred from what was said that the transmission belts were what were formerly known as the united front organizations; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; that is all organizations for the masses of workers, in which we would unite people with various views.

Mr. THOMAS. At one time in your testimony you referred to them as the united front, and at another time you referred to the same organizations as transmission belts. Are those two terms as used by the Communists synonymous?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. You mentioned specifically the Workers Alliance as being one of the transmission belts.

Mr. BROWDER. Transmission belts refer entirely to the Communists' approach to the problems of reaching the masses. Transmission belts mean having Communists work among the masses in the various organizations. If you say that the leaders of the organizations are transmission belts that makes it senseless.

Mr. THOMAS. As I understand it, some of those organizations are the Workers Alliance of America. The American League for Peace

and Democracy, and the American Youth Congress. Those are three mentioned here this afternoon.

I also want to know whether these organizations can be included: The International Congress of American Democracies. That is one. Is it all right to include that?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with that particular name. If you will name the various organizations, I will tell you.

Mr. THOMAS. There is the International Congress of American Democracies.

Mr. BROWDER. I am not familiar with the name. I would say there have been those along this line that could go under that head.

Mr. THOMAS. How about the National Lawyers' Guild?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; they are one of the organizations.

Mr. THOMAS. And the American Students Union?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And the National Negro Congress?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And the World Youth Congress?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And the Southern Conference for Human Welfare?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And the Negro Youth Congress.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And the Consumers' National Federation?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. And the American Civil Liberties Union?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, I have here a list of all these organizations which you—

Mr. BROWDER. I could add to that considerably.

Mr. THOMAS. I know you can, but I just have this list, and it is interesting to note, that at the national convention of each of these organizations last year the following governmental officials either gave the opening address of welcome, or made the opening address. At the International Congress of American Democracies, they were greeted at the opening by Secretary Henry A. Wallace. At the convention of the National Lawyers' Guild the opening address was delivered by Secretary Harold Ickes.

At the convention of the American League for Peace and Democracy, there were opening greetings in writing from Secretary Ickes, who was forced by pressure to cancel a personal appearance.

At the convention of the American Students' Union, it was opened by written greetings from President Roosevelt.

At the National Negro Congress, the opening address was delivered by Secretary Ickes.

At the opening of the World Youth Congress, the opening address was delivered by Mrs. Roosevelt.

At the convention of the Workers' Alliance, it was opened by addresses by Mr. Aubrey Williams and Mr. Robert Bulkley.

The American Youth Congress was opened by Mrs. Roosevelt.

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare was opened by greetings from President Roosevelt.

The Negro Youth Congress was opened by greetings from Secretary Ickes.

The Consumers' National Federation convention was opened by an address by Secretary Henry A. Wallace; and at the convention of the American Civil Liberties Union, the opening address was delivered by Secretary Ickes.

Of course, that may have been just a coincidence, but it seems to me to be more than a coincidence. It seems as though the New Deal was hand in glove with the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this a speech or a question?

Mr. THOMAS. No; it is not a speech. I just want to say this now, that it seems that the New Deal is working along hand in glove with the Communist Party. The New Deal is either for the Communist Party, or is playing into the hands of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us confine ourselves to the subject under consideration.

Mr. DEMPSEY. They could not play along with the Republican Party, because it has practically gone out of existence.

Mr. THOMAS. No Republican would want to play with them.

Mr. BRODSKY. May I suggest that the New Deal and the Democratic Party be examined as to whether they are subversive?

Mr. THOMAS. Not the Democratic Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us not have any exchange of personal opinions.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I want to make this observation. I think it is highly unethical for any member of this committee to say he has been waiting for an hour to ask a question of the witness who is under subpoena, and then, instead of doing that, make what I think is a cheap political speech, where there is no question and no answer at all. [Applause.]

I resent that kind of thing. If any member of the committee wants to ask this witness a question, or any other witness, let him ask the question and give the witness an opportunity to answer the question, and then not at the conclusion of the question say, "I do not wish to hear any answer," and make a political speech.

Mr. THOMAS. In answer to that I want to say if you will examine the record you will find I did ask a question of Mr. Browder.

Mr. DEMPSEY. He was not permitted to answer.

Mr. THOMAS. He did answer it when I referred to each organization.

Furthermore, I want to say this, through the Chair, to Mr. Dempsey. It was no more a cheap political trick than what was done here yesterday morning when this Davidson matter was brought up, and this straw man was referred to.

Mr. DEMPSEY. By whom?

Mr. THOMAS. You know by whom; you were here at the time.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not by me.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not say it was by you, but it was brought up to smear the Republican Party.

There has not been any proof submitted by Mr. Browder to show that any such man ever existed.

Mr. BROWDER. May I say that so far as my testimony of yesterday is concerned—

The CHAIRMAN. Everybody has had an opportunity to express himself.

Mr. BROWDER. I have not had an opportunity to speak about this challenge to my testimony at all. I would like to make this brief

observation. I am certain that if any responsible, competent person, with the authority of the Government behind him, wants to get the details behind my testimony of yesterday, he can get it, and I will give him my special cooperation.

Mr. THOMAS. I defy you to supply information that can prove this charge. It is nothing more than a straw man.

Mr. BROWDER. I am willing to cooperate with anyone who wants to get to the bottom of it.

Mr. THOMAS. It is up to you to prove your statement, but you cannot do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Just one second. May the Chair suggest that it is better procedure for every member to ask questions concerning the matter under discussion, and let us avoid any discussion among members, or any heated statements, or any personal remarks.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, you are acquainted with the book entitled "Marx and the Trade Unions," by A. Lozovsky?

Mr. BROWDER. I have seen it; I have not read it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know, Mr. Browder, that this book is used as a textbook in the Workers School of the Communist Party in New York?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not doubt it. I am not familiar with the facts, but I would not question it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it not true that the Communists have their own distinctive trade-union policies?

Mr. BROWDER. No; that is not true.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do the Communists have their own distinctive tactics with reference to trade unions?

Mr. BROWDER. We have our own distinctive tactics with regard to our relations between Communists and non-Communists within the unions, in connection with the work of our own union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is it true that Marx, and after him Lenin, and after him Lozovsky said that the trade unions are the school of communism?

Mr. BROWDER. I think it has been said.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a matter of fact, it is said rather frequently in the book which we have before us.

Lozovsky, on page 137 of the book in question, says:

It means that the revolutionary Marxists have their own strike tactics, differing radically from the strike tactics of the anarchists and reformists.

That would seem to indicate that the revolutionary Marxists have their own strike tactics.

Mr. BROWDER. But those strike tactics did differ radically from those of the anarchists. That does not mean that we have our own policies to put forward in the trade unions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On page 134 of the same book, Lozovsky says:

We have already seen that Marx and Engels referred to strikes as "social war" as "economic revolt," "real civil war," "guerilla war," "school of war," "advanced guard collisions."

Mr. BROWDER. What is the question?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The question is, Is that the Communist view with reference to strikes?

Mr. BROWDER. That is the view of one Communist in examining the question from one particular angle.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who is A. Lozovsky?

Mr. BROWDER. He was formerly general secretary of the Red International Labor Union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is his present position?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was at one time the head of the Communist revolutionary trade-union movement of the world?

Mr. BROWDER. He was the head of the Red International Labor Union, including others besides Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with Marx' philosophy in which he said:

In this struggle—a veritable civil war—are united and developed all these elements necessary for a future battle; once having reached this point, association takes on a political character.

Do you subscribe to that as the Communist's view in regard to labor union strikes?

Mr. BROWDER. Before answering that I would like to make a general statement, that it is impossible to express my views or the views of the Communist Party in any series of disconnected quotations, and further, that you can have no dogma that can be stated in such a collection of these short quotations. And the attempt to get me, by the accumulation of instance after instance of saying, "I think that this is a fair expression," or "This is correct," and so on, to create the impression that this gives any sort of idea of the views of the Communist Party, is not correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, is it not the practice of the Communist Party to set forth its views in series of disconnected slogans?

Mr. BROWDER. Not disconnected. If you want an example of just how the Communist Party works—

Mr. MATTHEWS. You just stated that.

Mr. BROWDER. No; I did not. I wanted to, but it was diverted. But we had just a national committee meeting in which we put forward some 26 slogans expressing the needs of the day, but it is in no way comparable to the effort to give our views with such a series of quotations. I would be very glad to furnish the committee with this list of slogans which express the political views rather clearly of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the situation is this, as I understand it: This book is an official textbook of the Communist Party in its Workers School in New York, written by a man who was the head of the Communist trade-union movement of the world at one time. The book is published by International Publishers, which is closely associated in some manner with the Communist Party. This book, read in its entirety, as well as in any series of quotations, sets forth beyond any possible doubt that Communists have a purpose in trade-union work which differs radically from the purposes held by the ordinary American trade-unionist, so much so that there is nothing in common between the two except the words "trade-union." Trade-union, as it is understood by the American people, by the Congress of the United States, by the American Federation of Labor, and by a large number of officials and members of other organizations, has absolutely nothing to do with the views of the Communist Party as set forth in its own textbook. Now, I believe the document is much too large to incorporate in its entirety in the record, though I

think that would be an important step to take if enough people would read the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Why not do this? I think this would be fair to the witness. Ask him to read the statement; ask him if that expresses the position of the Communist Party; and if he cannot answer that without an explanation, afford him an opportunity to further explain wherein that does not fully explain the position of the Communist Party.

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On page 135 of Lozovsky's book we read:

If a strike which has purely economic demands as its point of departure is from the very beginning consciously directed along the line of combining it with the political struggle, it yields maximum effects. Marx knew that the economic strike was an important weapon in the hands of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, since everything that deals a blow to the capitalist system.

Do you have any comment, Mr. Browder, to make on that as a view which diverges from the view of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. That gives a very poor idea about the relations between the Communist Party and the trade-unions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you think that those words could be clarified and elaborated indefinitely, and would they then mean something different from what they mean when standing apart?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not want to assume any responsibility for the writings of any individual except those that I cite as authority in my writings.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it true that that book that Mr. Matthews is quoting from is used as a textbook in the Communist schools?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not sure, but I think it was. I cannot deny it.

The CHAIRMAN. According to your own admissions, this man was originally secretary of the International Red Labor movement; is not that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct; but that does not make him ipso facto a spokesman on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. That was not what you were asked.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; that is exactly what I was asked. I was answering a different question entirely.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Browder, that statement is not a true statement of the Communist Party with reference to strikes—the purpose of a strike?

Mr. BROWDER. That is absolutely not anything like any declaration of policy of the Communist Party of the United States, and it is not a guiding thought of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. STARNES. I am talking about it from the standpoint of the international organization.

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I cannot answer questions in such a broad and loose sense. I can only answer directly what is the view of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. STARNES. And you have no connection now—absolutely no connection at all—with the international organization?

Mr. BROWDER. No. We have connections, but we are not responsible for every expression of opinion and every discussion in every book that is published, and we do not allow anybody to place us in a position of tying ourselves to the word of any particular individual.

The CHAIRMAN. I think Mr. Browder will agree—he has previ-

ously stated this thing, and I think that he will agree—that in all the movements in which Communists have participated, whether political activity, church activity, school activity, or what not, the real objective is the eventual and ultimate establishment of communism.

Mr. BROWDER. I have said that many times.

The CHAIRMAN. And, while that is the ultimate objective of all your activities, as I understand your testimony, you also have an immediate objective, aside and apart from the ultimate objective. Is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. They are connected.

The CHAIRMAN. They are connected, of course. The immediate objective would not be interesting to you unless it also led in the direction of the general objective?

Mr. BROWDER. And the general objective would not be interesting unless it could be connected with the immediate reality.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not here consciously or purposely doing anything to make capitalism work, yourself?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, sometimes we are. It is not a question of making it work or not making it work.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not trying to help the capitalists, are you?

Mr. BROWDER. We are trying to help the people, and as long as capitalism exists, producing goods for the people means to help capitalism. You cannot live without helping capitalism to keep on functioning.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true in the broad sense.

Mr. BROWDER. So do not accuse us of wanting to stop capitalism from working unless you accuse us of wanting to stop the people from eating. The people cannot eat except by keeping the industries functioning.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. But you have just stated that you have an ultimate objective in all of your activity, which is the establishment of communism in the United States; that is true, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the real thing you have in view?

Mr. BROWDER. To be able to feed and clothe and house the people through a social system which would give them more.

The CHAIRMAN. To establish a communistic system in the United States; that is right, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. If that is not your main objective, there would not be any reason for your existence.

Mr. BROWDER. We proclaim that all the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Then all your tactics and your strategy lead in that direction, do they not?

Mr. BROWDER. It does not require any long examination to find that out. That is proclaimed.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Then, of course, in the trade-union movement your members are looking always to the promotion of communism through your trade-union activity?

Mr. BROWDER. Wherever they are.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the answer to the proposition. Go ahead.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, in view of that answer, I think it will be unnecessary at this time to take more of the committee's time to read these excerpts.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one thing that I would like to have him answer here. You say that there are 50,000 members in the unions?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not say that that is exact.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand; but that is your best judgment as secretary of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. It is something like that.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that there are approximately thirty-three and two-thirds thousand in the C. I. O., and 16,000, approximately, in the A. F. of L.?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the 50,000 that are working actively in the trade-union movement in the United States, you stated, as I understood it—and if you did not, say so—that as a whole those men, by reason of their training, are much better qualified than the average run of trade unionists. Is that a fact?

Mr. BROWDER. I say that among them you will find a larger portion of trained men than in any unselected group.

The CHAIRMAN. That is because of the special training that you have given them?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not say that they are all trained.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. BROWDER. But among them you will find a larger proportion of trained men.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it is a much larger proportion, is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Not much larger, but it is larger.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Now, how many of the thirty-three and two-thirds thousand in the C. I. O. are organizers and officials in the C. I. O.?

Mr. BROWDER. I have no accurate statistics on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it as many as half?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you say you have no statistics. Give us what the facts are.

Mr. BROWDER. I would say it could be numbered in the hundreds.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, is the same thing true in the A. F. of L.?

Mr. BROWDER. About the same proportion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that your members have more difficulty in joining and staying in the A. F. of L. than in the C. I. O.?

Mr. BROWDER. That is true only of a few unions. Generally it is not true. It used to be years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, as to the unions in which they do have difficulty in joining and staying in, they conceal their identity?

Mr. BROWDER. If they are deprived of their rights.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the general policy to conceal their identity if they are deprived of their rights?

Mr. BROWDER. It is the practice.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the practice of self-preservation?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. But that only applies to a few unions in the A. F. of L.?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore, in the great majority of unions, Communists, both the ones who are just ordinary members and those who are organizers and officials, are known, or should be well known to the officials and to the other members; is that a fact?

Mr. BROWDER. To the same degree that they inquire about the politics of anybody. It does not mean that they are necessarily well known. Most of the people in the trade-union movement are not known by their polities. There is very little attention paid to whether a man is a Republican, a Democrat, a Socialist, or a Communist, except when political controversy focuses attention upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. There is this difference, however—that if a man is a real Communist, in the sense that you define it, he is supposed to be active and working at the job all the time, is he not?

Mr. BROWDER. That is also supposed to be a little bit true about Democrats. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. I know there are some sympathizers here, but do not express yourself.

Mr. BROWDER. I know there are some sympathizers here.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Browder, as a matter of fact, truthfully, the historic position of your party has always been that it furnishes the leadership for the working class; is not that true?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. We try to furnish thinking when thinking is absent. We try to give solutions to problems.

The CHAIRMAN. You furnish leadership; is that correct?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And your party never seeks large numbers, does it?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes; we like numbers too; but not at the expense of quality.

The CHAIRMAN. But quality is the prime consideration?

Mr. BROWDER. Quality is number one; numbers is number two.

The CHAIRMAN. But quantity is not your objective?

Mr. BROWDER. Not if quality has to be sacrificed.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the facts are that in Soviet Russia, with 165,000,000 people, according to your own statement, you have only 3½ million members now, after about 8 or 9 years of communism.

Mr. BROWDER. And in America, after a great many more years, the Democratic Party only has a few tens of thousands of actual primary members, and it has 27,000,000 voters. But if you measure it by voters, as you measure the Democratic Party here, then the Communist Party has eight or ninety million.

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking of the party members, the actual party members. You said there were 3½ million.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; that is the equivalent of the Democratic Party men in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. And they are the line of the vanguard; that was the theory of Marx, Lenin, and all of them, was it not?

Mr. BROWDER. That is true; that was the theory.

The CHAIRMAN. And the theory was that those who were well-trained would lead the others in the establishment of a dictatorship of the working class?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And you now have broadened the working class, have you not, to include practically everybody except the millionaires in the working class, have you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, we include the wage workers.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean, you include professional people, lawyers, doctors, and all classes, do you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Those who work for wages.

The CHAIRMAN. Everybody who works for wages.

Mr. BROWDER. But when we speak of the workers' government, we do not mean for the exclusive benefit of the workers. We mean under the leadership of the workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The workers are to govern the country?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Through the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Through the support of the majority of the other people also.

The CHAIRMAN. But through the instrumentality of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, every government has a party.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not maintain that communism as preached by all of the early founders has been applied in Russia to this day, do you?

Mr. BROWDER. I think they have made long strides toward its realization.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that Stalin himself and other Communist leaders have pointed out that it is in a state of suspension?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. That people have to be prepared for the ultimate realization of the Communist principle?

Mr. BROWDER. No; that is a misconception to speak of suspension. They are not in suspension. They are going forward very rapidly. To give you an example of how rapidly they are going forward, in the last 10 years, in which the rest of the world has been sliding backward in the production of wealth, they have multiplied the production of wealth 10 times.

The CHAIRMAN. That is because they had farther to go in comparison with the rest of the world.

Mr. BROWDER. Well, there is plenty of the rest of the world about which you could say the same thing. So it is not a state of suspension; it is the most rapid progress that has ever been conceived.

The CHAIRMAN. You think they have a superior form of government?

Mr. BROWDER. I think that they have discovered a superior form of government.

Mr. STARNES. You think it is a better form of government?

Mr. BROWDER. That does not express my idea exactly. I think the principle of its system is proving itself superior by producing wealth on a larger scale than was ever known before in history.

Mr. MASON. And yet do you contend that it has provided a higher standard of living than we have?

Mr. BROWDER. Not yet; but if the tendencies of development continue 10 more years in the same way that they did in the last 10 years, then at the end of the next 10 years their standard of living will be

higher than that of America. That is mathematically demonstrable.

Mr. CASEY. There are some other things that are of more value than that.

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes; many other things.

Mr. CASEY. For instance, the ordinary freedom of the people, freedom of religion, and many other things.

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes; many other things; and if I emphasize the economic, it is because all the other things depend upon the economic.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Browder, do I understand you to believe that the economic conditions in Russia are better than they are here in the United States today?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I did not say that. I said it would take another 10 years of this progress and another 10 years of American stagnation before they would surpass us in standards of living.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you admit that economic conditions in the United States are better than they are in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, yes. I am not forced to admit it; I say it voluntarily.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Browder's attorney, sworn as a witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, we are not excusing Mr. Browder? I have a number of questions that I would like to ask him.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

#### TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH R. BRODSKY, ATTORNEY, NEW YORK CITY

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. What is your full name, Mr. Brodsky?

Mr. BRODSKY. My name is Joseph R. Brodsky.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your residence address?

Mr. BRODSKY. My residence is 45 Wadsworth Terrace, New York City.

Mr. WHITLEY. And your business address?

Mr. BRODSKY. 100 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what is your business?

Mr. BRODSKY. I am an attorney.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you ever have a business address at 799 Broadway?

Mr. BRODSKY. Yes; I did.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was an office address?

Mr. BRODSKY. That was my office address.

Mr. WHITLEY. When did you have that address, Mr. Brodsky?

Mr. BRODSKY. I was in that building twice; once about 18 years ago. I stayed there for 5 years, and I came back to the building about 6 or 7 years ago.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long have you been a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Brodsky?

Mr. BRODSKY. I am not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Brodsky, did you ever perform any official functions for the Communist Party, such as might be performed by a member—any duties of any kind?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. I mean, which would be aside from legal representation?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which would be strictly in the category of party functions or duties?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yesterday Mr. Browder testified that to his knowledge the Communist Party of the United States had never received subsidies or contributions or financial assistance from outside of the United States. That is, we had particular reference to the Soviet Government, the Comintern, or the parties in other countries. I believe you heard that testimony.

Mr. BRODSKY. I did.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Brodsky, have you, on behalf of the Communist Party of the United States, ever received any funds from other countries?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or from other parties?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or from any official organizations or agencies of the Soviet Government or the Communist Party?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have not?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to introduce an official document of the British Crown. This document is captioned "Russia No. 2," and is dated 1927. The title of the document is "Documents Illustrating the Hostile Activities of the Soviet Government and the Third International Against Great Britain. Presented to Parliament by Command of His Majesty." This document bears the caption "Command Paper No. 2874." This was obtained from the Library of Congress. This document of some 31 pages is an official reproduction of documents which were obtained as the result of a police raid that was made by the London police on the Soviet House in London in 1927.

Part 1 of this document is captioned as follows:

Documents found by the police in the course of the search in Soviet House, and referred to by the Prime Minister in his statement on the 24th of May 1927.

On page 20 of this document there is reproduced a list of addresses found in the possession of Anton Miller. Anton Miller being the cipher or code expert who was arrested at the time of the raid on Soviet House, which housed various organizations of the Soviet Government.

Among those addresses listed which were found on the person of Anton Miller is the following:

For money per bank: Joseph R. Brodsky, 799 Broadway, New York.

Can you explain that, Mr. Brodsky?

Mr. BRODSKY. No; I was not able to explain it at the time that the papers announced it and I am not able to explain it now, sir. There was a complete investigation of my books at the time by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and they found that every dollar had been accounted for.

Mr. WHITLEY. You had no difficulty?

Mr. BRODSKY. Subsequently I made a trip to London, and I had no difficulty in getting a passport and visa.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were traveling under your own name?

Mr. BRODSKY. I always traveled under my own name.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the same list of addresses found on the person of Anton Miller there appears the following:

Moness Chemical Co., Inc., 426 Broome Street, New York.

Do you know anything about the Moness Chemical Co.?

Mr. BRODSKY. No; I have no present recollection of it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any vague recollection that you may have known of such an organization in the past?

Mr. BRODSKY. I don't know. I have known of hundreds of corporations in the past years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Then the following appears:

Moness private address: Mr. J. Moness, 787 Crotona Park North, Bronx, N. Y.

You do not know anything about that?

Mr. BRODSKY. I never lived there in my life, and do not know anything about it.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know Mr. J. Moness?

Mr. BRODSKY. No; I don't recall him.

Mr. WHITLEY. On that same list appears the following:

Joseph R. Brodsky, room 703, 41 Union Square, New York.

Do you know how he happened to have that address?

Mr. BRODSKY. Let's see; that is an office address that I had, I think, subsequent to when I moved out of 799, and from which I moved back—that is my impression—to 799.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, this may have been a later address that Mr. Miller had for you?

Mr. BRODSKY. Prior or later; I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you did occupy an office at room 703, 41 Union Square?

Mr. BRODSKY. Yes; that was an office address that I had.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did the International Labor Defense have offices at that same address?

Mr. BRODSKY. No; not to my knowledge.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the same list of addresses and information removed from the person of Mr. Anton Miller was the following, written in German. This particular portion of the list, incidentally, is broken up by countries, the addresses listed under the captions "Brazil," "Chile," "Uruguay," "Australia," "South Africa," and so forth.

Under the heading "U. S. A." appears the following; and this is in German. I have had it translated.

Addresses for sending money.

1. Joseph Brodsky, room 703, 41 Union Square, New York.

And under that, written in German:

For the party and other organizations.

That is under the caption "Addresses for sending money."

Were you ever able to find out anything about that, Mr. Brodsky?

Mr. BRODSKY. This is the first time I ever heard of that in my life.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not doubt the authenticity of this document?

Mr. BRODSKY. I do. I wouldn't put it past the British Government, which at the same time forged letters for the purpose of ousting

a labor government by phony documents of that kind. I am not accusing you of participating in it.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is all right, Mr. Brodsky.

Now, under that same caption, "Addresses for sending money," we have:

2. J. Moness, 787 Crotona Park North, Bronx, New York.

Then, in German:

For trade unions. Only upon special instructions from the Profintern.

The Profintern being the governing body of the R. I. L. U., as I understand it. Is that correct Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. Profintern; yes. It is an abbreviation of the Russian—

Mr. WHITLEY. For the R. I. L. U.; is it synonymous?

Mr. BROWDER. It is an abbreviation of the Russian words for "Trade Union International."

Mr. WHITLEY. And you have never been able to determine why your name is listed in here in such a manner, Mr. Brodsky?

Mr. BRODSKY. Never.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have attempted to find out, however?

Mr. BRODSKY. I did at the time.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know what that statement there, "Addresses for the transmission of funds," could possibly refer to?

Mr. BRODSKY. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not Mr. Brodsky attorney for a good many organizations?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is very true, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You are attorney for the International Labor Defense?

Mr. BRODSKY. Not now. I was. I was chief counsel for many years.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you counsel for the International Workers Order?

Mr. BRODSKY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Counsel for the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever been counsel for the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Or counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. For the International Publishers?

Mr. BRODSKY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. For the Workers Alliance?

Mr. BRODSKY. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. There are several of them that I do not know.

Mr. BRODSKY. Also, attorney for some organizations; also attorney for clients in regular business.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever seen this document before?

Mr. BRODSKY. Never in my life.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you like to see it?

Mr. BRODSKY. I would like to see it. I am not doubting that you think it is authentic, but I would like to know who prepared it, in the first place.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is an official document.

Mr. BRODSKY. An official document.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of the British Government.

Mr. BRODSKY. Of the British Government; yes. But I know there was an official document also presented concerning the Czechoslovakian situation in Parliament, but I don't know who prepared it.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you ever been attorney for the Daily Worker?

Mr. BRODSKY. I was at one time. I was not the attorney in the bankruptcy proceedings. I had nothing to do with that.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything further?

Mr. WHITLEY. Just one more question, Mr. Browder. Do you know Moness?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not?

Mr. BROWDER. I never heard of the name.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Gentlemen, I understand some of you wish to ask Mr. Browder some questions.

Mr. STARNES. I have one or two questions.

Mr. BRODSKY. Mr. Chairman, may I call attention to the fact that Congressman Dempsey said that Mr. Browder was here under subpoena. As a matter of fact he appears voluntarily; did not require any service at all.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Browder, you said that you no longer used the term "dictatorship of the proletariat" because it conveyed a misleading conception of the work of the party.

Mr. BROWDER. I did not say we do not use it except in speaking to a mixed crowd.

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. We use it in classrooms where we can see it is given the proper understanding.

Mr. STARNES. Now, in speaking to mixed crowds you use the term "central democracy"?

Mr. BROWDER. The usual term in that connection is democratic centralism.

Mr. STARNES. Democratic centralism?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. I believe you have stated the Communist Party has its transmission belts or, as I would say, a medium of operation, such as the trade-union movement. You use schools and colleges also?

Mr. BROWDER. Everywhere where people come together.

Mr. STARNES. The answer would be "yes."

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. That is an inclusive expression; but we use any place where people come together.

Mr. STARNES. I understand; I am asking at this moment with reference to schools and colleges.

Now you first started your movements, initiated your movement among the trade-union movement for the propagation of communism?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say that we gave first consideration to them as the most important organization of the workers.

Mr. STARNES. And the purpose of that was to organize the workers and use that as a medium for furthering the policy and program of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; the first purpose was to improve the condition of the workers.

Mr. STARNES. I understand. And by using them, by controlling the labor unions you would be in position to control—

Mr. BROWDER (continuing). We were not attempting to control.

Mr. STARNES. Not at this time, but you have undertaken it at one time?

Mr. BROWDER. We found that the whole question of control was illusionary.

Mr. STARNES. That is true; you found that to be true in actual practice, but I say at one time that was the method you pursued?

Mr. BROWDER. There was talk by the Communists that they wanted to control the unions, but we quickly learned better.

Mr. STARNES. You soon learned better?

Mr. BROWDER. Long ago.

Mr. STARNES. And now you find the better and more effective approach is through schools and colleges, do you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I would not say that schools and colleges are a substitute for the labor movement.

Mr. STARNES. No; but they are a medium through which you do operate, one of the mediums?

Mr. BROWDER. We always have to the extent of our ability. It is not something new.

Mr. STARNES. Another might be said to be the United Front, as another medium through which you operate?

Mr. BROWDER. That is a general term that includes all organizations.

Mr. STARNES. Right now I am trying to get information; I am not familiar with the whole set-up.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; and I am trying my best to answer.

Mr. STARNES. You have named for the benefit of the record a number of these transmission belts.

Mr. BROWDER. And could name many more.

Mr. STARNES. Will you name a few more?

Mr. BROWDER. The churches.

Mr. STARNES. You now use the churches?

Mr. BROWDER. We give special attention to the churches, because in the churches there is already a great peace movement which we consider very important, and we establish contact with them everywhere we can.

Mr. STARNES. What success have you had?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, considerable. I have, for example, a pamphlet here of one of my speeches published by the church.

Mr. STARNES. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. A speech delivered before a congregation, and the church itself published it in pamphlet form.

Mr. STARNES. What church was that?

Mr. BROWDER. This was the Community Church in Boston, to which I spoke on Sunday, March 5, 1939, and addressed Catholics, Jews, and

Protestants, and it was printed by the church and distributed through its own congregation.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, have you made any special effort to place teachers in schools and colleges who are advocates of communism?

Mr. BROWDER. No; we have not.

Mr. STARNES. But you do have quite a number in different educational institutions?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not be able to say how many.

Mr. STARNES. But you have a number; I am not asking you the exact number.

Mr. BROWDER. I think we have certain influence in the schools.

Mr. STARNES. And teachers in schools?

Mr. BROWDER. Teachers?

Mr. STARNES. Yes; schools and colleges?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; our influence is much greater than our membership. The membership is relatively small.

Mr. STARNES. I understand. But you do have that influence and exert it in every college—

Mr. BROWDER. I would not say it is exerted in every college in America.

Mr. STARNES. You have in Harvard?

Mr. BROWDER. I would not want to say any particular one. I have seen what happened when I mentioned Harvard once before and representatives from the legislature went down there and made it very unpleasant, and I do not like to cause trouble to anybody.

Mr. STARNES. Would you say in Columbia?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Brooklyn?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And in City College?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. The University of Minnesota?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I have made special speeches in some 23 colleges and universities of America and I have always had very good reception.

Mr. STARNES. Through what medium or what organization on the campus?

Mr. BROWDER. Usually some organization on the campus, a campus group, debating, speaking.

Mr. STARNES. The American Students Union?

Mr. BROWDER. A few times; not many.

Mr. STARNES. What other groups?

Mr. BROWDER. Usually some speaking group on the campus, a discussion group.

Mr. STARNES. You have been quite active along the political front, have you not?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I have been secretary of the party.

Mr. STARNES. Well, I want to know. You have used the political term in your testimony in such a generic sense that I do not know, and I want to have you tell me just what you have been doing. You have been quite active?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, quite active, politically.

Mr. STARNES. All the time?

Mr. BROWDER. All of the time.

Mr. STARNES. You consider every movement of the party is a political movement?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Whether it is bound up in economics, theology, or what not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. It has a political meaning?

Mr. BROWDER. For us as Communists, as those who deal with the political life; others may be dealing with the same question but do not give it the same political significance.

Mr. STARNES. Have you attempted at any time to create divisions within the major political parties of America?

Mr. BROWDER. We have not.

Mr. STARNES. You have sought to have an influence over them?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; we have sought to influence every organization in America; we want to influence the minds of everybody we can.

Mr. STARNES. Have you attempted the formation of a Farmer-Labor party in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. We have not.

Mr. STARNES. Have you encouraged such a movement?

Mr. BROWDER. We have encouraged it wherever it appears.

Mr. STARNES. You have encouraged it?

Mr. BROWDER. We have encouraged it wherever it has appeared.

Mr. STARNES. How is the international organization supported, financially?

Mr. BROWDER. The international?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. It is supported by dues from affiliated parties.

Mr. STARNES. And in America you would say what is equivalent to one month's dues, and the dues are paid three times per year to the international?

Mr. BROWDER. No; we have never contributed to that support; what we have raised is for the purpose of international solidarity, but we contribute to no particular party work except under special circumstances.

Mr. STARNES. But of course along party lines?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And in conformity with party lines?

Mr. BROWDER. Of course.

Mr. STARNES. And in that respect you have contributed to the support of the International?

Mr. BROWDER. In an indirect way; it was not direct.

Mr. STARNES. But you have?

Mr. BROWDER. But very indirectly, of course.

Mr. STARNES. What do you do with the 35 percent of the collections from your members which is turned over to your national party organization?

Mr. BROWDER. That is kept for office expense.

Mr. STARNES. At headquarters. Has it ever been expended in support of party lines in other countries?

Mr. BROWDER. No; none of that.

Mr. STARNES. None of that has been expended outside this country?

Mr. BROWDER. None outside of this country.

Mr. STARNES. None of it?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. None of that 35 percent has been spent outside of this country?

Mr. BROWDER. Only in the sense of paying my traveling expenses, for example, and so forth.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, who else has been attending any of the meetings of the congress, of the party at Moscow since 1919; any other delegates? Could you give their names?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not.

Mr. STARNES. Up until 1919?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. How about 1920?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I cannot.

Mr. STARNES. In 1921?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I could not.

Mr. STARNES. 1922?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. 1924?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I could not.

Mr. STARNES. 1928?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not.

Mr. STARNES. 1935?

Mr. BROWDER. 1935 I can name some of the delegates.

Mr. STARNES. How many delegates could go from this country?

Mr. BROWDER. In 1935 we were entitled to 20 delegates, but I do not think we sent the whole number.

Mr. STARNES. Who paid their expenses?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party of the United States paid their traveling expenses and the congress provided them with a livelihood while they were there.

Mr. STARNES. Will you furnish for the record at this point the names of the delegates and indentify them for us?

Mr. BROWDER. I will try to provide that for you.

Mr. STARNES. When did you first go to Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. 1921.

Mr. STARNES. 1921?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. When did you next go?

Mr. BROWDER. 1926.

Mr. STARNES. What was the purpose of your first visit?

Mr. BROWDER. I was a trade-union delegate.

Mr. STARNES. What was the purpose of the 1926 visit?

Mr. BROWDER. Again I was a trade-union delegate.

Mr. STARNES. How long did you remain there in 1921?

Mr. BROWDER. Three or four months.

Mr. STARNES. In 1926, how long did you remain there?

Mr. BROWDER. I was there maybe 9 months, or 10 months.

Mr. STARNES. Did the convention last that long?

Mr. BROWDER. No, no.

Mr. STARNES. Did you take any special training in Russia at the time, attend any university or special training course?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I considered that I helped myself a good deal, but not from attending any school. I was doing office work.

Mr. STARNES. You occupied yourself during that period, supported yourself?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. What sort of office work were you doing?

Mr. BROWDER. I was working on a newspaper, for America, providing information, reports, and so on.

Mr. STARNES. That was the type of work you were doing at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Were you sending any information from Russia back to America?

Mr. BROWDER. I was not. I wrote some articles.

Mr. STARNES. Did you send anything other than what you wrote at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. From 1926 on when was your next visit or trip to Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. I had a brief visit in 1927.

Mr. STARNES. 1927, for a week's visit?

Mr. BROWDER. A brief visit.

Mr. STARNES. You had a brief visit?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Did you go there at that time as a delegate to represent any organization, that is, 1927?

Mr. BROWDER. In 1927 I was in Russia on the way back from China.

Mr. STARNES. Yes. That was when you went to China as a delegate to a trade-union meeting?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Now did you bring back any report of any sort from that meeting in China to any type of meeting in Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. I spoke at several meetings in Russia, public meetings.

Mr. STARNES. Where were you living in 1921, and again in 1926; in what city? I do not care about the street address; where did you live, what city?

Mr. BROWDER. In Moscow.

Mr. STARNES. Moscow each time?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Did you at that time contact the leadership of the party of the Soviet Union on either of your visits, 1921 or 1927?

Mr. BROWDER. When you say leaders—

Mr. STARNES. Those who were the leaders of the party at that time.

Mr. BROWDER. Well, it depends upon what you mean; I met them, but I did not talk with them.

Mr. STARNES. I mean have discussions with them.

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I would say at that time I hardly met them at all; I did not have any political discussion with the leaders of the party of the Soviet Union.

Mr. STARNES. In 1927, after that you did?

Mr. BROWDER. In later periods I did.

Mr. STARNES. In later periods?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. So beginning in 1927 and after 1927 when was your next visit to Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. 1928.

Mr. STARNES. In 1928 what time of the year was it, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. In the summer.

Mr. STARNES. In the summer; and that was to attend the congress?

Mr. BROWDER. The congress.

Mr. STARNES. How long did you remain there at this time?

Mr. BROWDER. Several weeks; I am not sure of the exact time.

Mr. STARNES. Did you stay in Moscow then?

Mr. BROWDER. In Moscow.

Mr. STARNES. And after 1928 what was the next year in which you visited Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. I passed through in 1929, passed through Moscow on the way to Vladivostock—that is on the Pacific coast, where the meeting took place, the Congress of the Trade Unions, on the Pacific coast.

Mr. STARNES. How many times did you go in 1928; just the one time in the summer?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. In 1929 did you go to or through Russia again after you passed through Moscow to Vladivostock to attend the Trade Union Congress?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I went to Vladivostock and came back again.

Mr. STARNES. How much time did you spend in Russia at this time?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, a few weeks.

Mr. STARNES. Did you say that was in 1929, when you attended the congress?

Mr. BROWDER. The Trade Union Congress?

Mr. STARNES. The Trade Union Congress.

Mr. BROWDER. At Vladivostock.

Mr. STARNES. Now, did you take over or did you receive any instructions at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. Instructions?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. No. If you mean by instructions, teaching or learning—I assume you mean by that something that someone wanted done.

Mr. STARNES. That is, any specific instructions along certain lines.

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Along certain lines of party activities?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I did not.

Mr. STARNES. You did not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. After 1929 when did you next go back?

Mr. BROWDER. Since that time I believe I have visited the Soviet Union once a year, every year, except this year.

Mr. STARNES. I see. You were there once in 1930?

Mr. BROWDER. Once in 1930, I believe.

Mr. STARNES. You are positive you did not go in the summer of 1930 and that you were again back there later?

Mr. BROWDER. I am pretty sure it was only once.

Mr. STARNES. How long did you remain there this time?

Mr. BROWDER. Some weeks.

Mr. STARNES. Did you go there in the summer?

Mr. BROWDER (continuing). Three or four weeks. I am not certain of the actual time of the year, except when I can identify it by some particular event.

Mr. STARNES. All right. What event did you attend this year, 1930?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know whether there was a general meeting or whether I just made a visit, one of my visits; I am not sure which one, whether I went entirely on my own initiative.

Mr. STARNES. You mean by that you paid your own expenses?

Mr. BROWDER. When I went the party paid it, that is, when I was attending a meeting of other parties. But I was making a visit of my own for the American party.

Mr. STARNES. For what particular purpose?

Mr. BROWDER. For the purpose of visiting the Soviet Union and seeing how things were going on, the progress of socialism, to converse with as many people as possible, get their views and in general ascertain their approach to the problems.

Mr. STARNES. And after you returned to America you arrived at practically the same conclusion and used the same tactics in this country that they used in that country?

Mr. BROWDER. Not the same; no.

Mr. STARNES. Wherever applicable, I mean.

Mr. BROWDER. Not the same.

Mr. STARNES. I qualified it by "wherever applicable."

Mr. BROWDER. We have always been very careful to avoid imitation because people who imitate do not get anywhere.

Mr. STARNES. All right; in 1931 how many times did you go there?

Mr. BROWDER. Once, I believe.

Mr. STARNES. Once only?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. At what time of the year was that, Mr. Browder?

Mr. BROWDER. I cannot identify the exact time.

Mr. STARNES. Do you not know about the particular time; was it in the early part of the year?

Mr. BROWDER. I cannot remember.

Mr. STARNES. You cannot remember?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. What was the purpose of the 1931 visit?

Mr. BROWDER. In each case it was the same.

Mr. STARNES. Well, I want to identify it a little more completely; I am asking for information; that is the only reason I am asking these questions. It may not seem important to you but I am trying to distinguish between the times you went there on your own and the times you were there as a representative of some group. Were you representing some particular group in 1931?

Mr. BROWDER. There was no special distinction between them when I went on my own account and otherwise.

Mr. STARNES. I wanted to know if there was a meeting over there of the so-called "red" labor movement. The "red" labor movement was in 1931, was it not? Was it to attend that meeting?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not sure; I did not attend the meeting of the Red International Labor Union after I became secretary of the party.

Mr. STARNES. What sort of a meeting did you attend after you became secretary?

Mr. BROWDER. Meetings of the Communist International.

Mr. STARNES. Communist International?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Was there a meeting of the Communist International in 1931?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not sure whether it was in 1931.

Mr. STARNES. What about 1932?

Mr. BROWDER. There were meetings in Moscow in those years but I would not want to say what particular year without refreshing my recollection.

Mr. STARNES. I understand you would not and I am not insisting that you do, but I am trying to get you to refresh your recollections.

Mr. BROWDER. I could not be sure without connecting it up with something.

Mr. STARNES. 1932 was the year of the national elections. Does that refresh your recollection of any meeting in Russia that you were attending?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. What was that meeting?

Mr. BROWDER. There was a gathering of the Executive Committee.

Mr. STARNES. Of the international organization?

Mr. BROWDER. I am pretty sure that it was 1932.

Mr. STARNES. That was the primary reason, the general election, was it not?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not sure whether that was in the spring or the fall; I cannot be sure.

Mr. STARNES. Did you go then again later on in the year?

Mr. BROWDER. 1932?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. Possibly at the end of 1932, but more likely it was the beginning of 1933 when I went again.

Mr. STARNES. You went in 1933. For what purpose did you go at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. The same purpose, to attend the meeting.

Mr. STARNES. How long did you stay there in 1933?

Mr. BROWDER. Four or five weeks.

Mr. STARNES. Were you there before or after the first Congress was convened under the present administration in 1933?

Mr. BROWDER. After.

Mr. STARNES. After?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. How long after the 100 days?

Mr. BROWDER. In 1933—I think the new administration came in March. Yes. I think that I went over there in April; that I was there about 2 months later than that.

Mr. STARNES. Two months later?

Mr. BROWDER. April or May.

Mr. STARNES. You were there in April or May?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Congress was still in session when you went?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Did you go later on in the same year, or were you there only once that year?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe not; 1934, early in 1934.

Mr. STARNES. You went there early in 1934?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. That was the year before the last congress of the party was held there?

Mr. BROWDER. The year before. I went there before the Seventh World Congress.

Mr. STARNES. How long did you stay at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. Oh, a few weeks.

Mr. STARNES. At what season of the year was that?

Mr. BROWDER. In the winter.

Mr. STARNES. In the winter?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Was it early in the winter of 1934, or late?

Mr. BROWDER. Early.

Mr. STARNES. You went there about the middle of the winter?

Mr. BROWDER. Middle of the winter.

Mr. STARNES. Were you there in 1935?

Mr. BROWDER. 1935.

Mr. STARNES. And attended the Seventh World Congress?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. How long did you remain in Russia at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. Several weeks.

Mr. STARNES. And what time was the congress held?

Mr. BROWDER. It was held in August.

Mr. STARNES. In August 1935?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Did you go more than one time in that year?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe not.

Mr. STARNES. In 1936, the next year, is the time that you ran for President; the year that you ran for President did you go to Russia that year?

Mr. BROWDER. I think I went to Moscow early in 1936, and I think I was there—let me see—I am not sure whether it was in the fall of that year or in the winter, the early months of 1937.

Mr. STARNES. That was before or after the campaign for President?

Mr. BROWDER. I was there both before and after.

Mr. STARNES. In that year?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; I am not sure whether it was in that year or not.

Mr. STARNES. Possibly two visits in 1936?

Mr. BROWDER. Either in 1936 or 1937.

Mr. STARNES. I see. Were you given any instructions to take to America in 1936?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. None whatsoever?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. In 1937; you went to Russia in 1937?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Two years ago?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. What month did you go?

Mr. BROWDER. It was toward the end of the year, and possibly, if I was not there twice in 1936 I was there twice in 1937.

Mr. STARNES. I see. That is as near as you can recall at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Before the two visits, whatever they were, 1936 or 1937—you paid two visits either in the winter or early fall?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Either in the early part of the year or the late months of 1936?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. What was the purpose of the 1937 meeting?

Mr. BROWDER. I was making the visits for the purpose of getting information.

Mr. STARNES. In carrying out the party's work?

Mr. BROWDER. In connection with the party's work and to see what the Soviet Union was doing. That was one of my political necessities, to see the Soviet Union as often as possible.

Mr. STARNES. I see. And that was the year that they made certain changes in positions in this country, 1937—

Mr. BROWDER. The biggest change in work came in 1935, following the discussions of the seventh world congress.

Mr. STARNES. In 1935 you began to change the terminology.

Mr. BROWDER. This all relates to 1935.

Mr. STARNES. I see. That is what I am getting at. Now, what time in 1938 did you go?

Mr. BROWDER. In 1938 I made a very brief visit in connection with a visit I had to make to France.

Mr. STARNES. In 1938; what time of the year did you make that visit?

Mr. BROWDER. In October.

Mr. STARNES. You were there in the month of October?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You have not been there in 1939?

Mr. BROWDER. 1939; no.

Mr. STARNES. You only had one visit in 1938?

Mr. BROWDER. In 1938 I made a very quick flying trip after I had made a visit to Paris where we had the conference about Spain and at that time discussed with the French party about assistance to Spain.

Mr. STARNES. Did you have a conference there in 1937 with reference to the Spanish situation?

Mr. BROWDER. Ever since the outbreak of the Spanish situation started I never attended a meeting that I did not discuss the Spanish situation and how to help the Spanish more; I have said that on any occasion I attended a meeting of the Communists of other countries; I have always talked of it.

Mr. STARNES. What about the Czechoslovakian situation in 1938?

Mr. BROWDER. That was not at my visit in 1938.

Mr. STARNES. What was the purpose of the meeting?

Mr. BROWDER. It was to get them interested in every possible way.

Mr. STARNES. In attending the international meetings of the organizations of the trade-unions—

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; wherever I was I talked about it.

Mr. STARNES. I understand; and in attending the international meetings you discussed the situation in Spain?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not only do it then, but every place where I talked with people.

Mr. STARNES. I understand; that was the policy of the International and various Communists who attended the International Party Congress.

Mr. BROWDER. Of the International Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. It was the policy to support the so-called Loyalist regime in Spain and try to interest people in preserving that regime?

Mr. BROWDER. Absolutely, unqualifiedly.

Mr. STARNES. And to interfere to the extent of allotting them finances, and to intervene in that struggle to the extent that you would send supplies either in men or arms; all that was discussed?

Mr. BROWDER. To get them to observe international law, which every country was failing to do.

Mr. STARNES. But you were willing to go to the extent—

Mr. BROWDER (interposing). To help them in every possible way.

Mr. STARNES. By furnishing food?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Material and supplies?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Men and arms?

Mr. BROWDER. Arms? No; supplies and food, but not arms.

Mr. STARNES. What about the Czechoslovakian situation? Was the attitude of the International Party the policy that you discussed at the meeting, that England should have stood firm at that time. That was discussed at that time?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communists believed that Czechoslovakia had to be defended and should be by all progressive democratic countries.

Mr. STARNES. And you urged that?

Mr. BROWDER. We urged that.

Mr. STARNES. And you were willing to supply them with people, and if necessary, arms and supplies, and to support them in whatever way you could?

Mr. BROWDER. We were ready to give them whatever help could be given under international law.

Mr. STARNES. And you have included everything necessary, including the sending of arms and ammunition?

Mr. BROWDER. I never heard the question raised of sending arms to Czechoslovakia.

Mr. STARNES. But that was urged, was it not?

Mr. BROWDER. Czechoslovakians in America had raised the question of going back home and fighting for their former country.

Mr. STARNES. What sort of action, then, did the party urge that should be taken to preserve Czechoslovakia, if it was not to fight?

Mr. BROWDER. Czechoslovakia could have defended herself if she had not been abandoned by her friends.

Mr. STARNES. That abandonment meant, in simple, plain words, that the others refused to help her fight to preserve her integrity?

Mr. BROWDER. No; they went farther than that.

Mr. STARNES. In your judgment, they betrayed her?

Mr. BROWDER. They violated their pledges.

Mr. STARNES. That is true. So you feel they should have fought, and you urged that action, did you not?

Mr. BROWDER. If necessary to preserve the independence of the country, I consider it is a necessary thing.

Mr. STARNES. And you feel that other nations should be given help who are alike menaced; is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. If it can be so organized without violating the interests of the other nations.

Mr. STARNES. Now, in respect to the cause of Spain, you urged everywhere people who believed in what you call "democracy" to go there and fight, did you not?

Mr. BROWDER. To pledge themselves to help win the war and pledge their automobiles—

Mr. STARNES. You encouraged them to fight, did you not?

Mr. BROWDER. To give every political encouragement to help Spain, in that form.

Mr. STARNES. And that is one war you were in, and did you not give some monetary support to those people?

Mr. BROWDER. We gave some monetary support to the Communist Party—very small compared to their needs, but as much as we were able.

Mr. STARNES. And through your various mass organizations, help was given to them, was it not?

Mr. BROWDER. We encouraged every organization to give funds to relieve Spain.

Mr. STARNES. And to furnish not only relief, but supplies: is not that true?

Mr. BROWDER. I think all the money raised in America was for relief.

Mr. STARNES. And you know of no money being raised in America to help send men there who were willing to fight for the preservation of democratic ideals and institutions, as you conceive them?

Mr. BROWDER. I know men went over from America. How they got their money, I do not know.

Mr. STARNES. They were paid, were they not, and financed to go?

Mr. BROWDER. How they raised their funds, I don't know. I know they did not go for pay; I know the character of those men.

Mr. STARNES. You say you know the character of those men?

Mr. BROWDER. I knew the most of them.

Mr. STARNES. The most of them were Communists, were they not?

Mr. BROWDER. A slight majority were.

Mr. STARNES. You said, I believe, about 60 percent?

Mr. BROWDER. Somewhere around that.

Mr. STARNES. Who paid their expenses over there?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know.

Mr. STARNES. Did not the mass organizations pay them?

Mr. BROWDER. There were a few cases where mass organizations paid them. I have heard of it.

Mr. STARNES. Did the Communist Party of the United States of America contribute any financial support to the movement to send those boys over there, to pay their expenses in any shape, form, or fashion?

Mr. BROWDER. No; the Communist Party did not.

Mr. STARNES. Directly, or indirectly?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party did not.

Mr. STARNES. As a party?

Mr. BROWDER. It did not.

Mr. STARNES. Did the Communist Party, as a party, pay for the transportation of any of those men from inland points to the seaports where they could obtain passage?

Mr. BROWDER. They did not.

Mr. STARNES. Did they assist in obtaining passports for any of those men?

Mr. BROWDER. They did not.

Mr. STARNES. Did they assist the line of communications which existed at that time between the United States and the Communist Party in France, in assisting those men to get to Spain?

Mr. BROWDER. The Communist Party had nothing to do with this whole business.

Mr. STARNES. As a party?

Mr. BROWDER. As an organization.

Mr. STARNES. But individual members, of course, did, you stated?

Mr. BROWDER. Many individual members went.

Mr. STARNES. All right, sir. Now, let us turn our attention to the members of your central committee: That is your governing body here in America?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. William Z. Foster: What is his official position in reference to the party in America?

Mr. BROWDER. He is the national chairman.

Mr. STARNES. And what else does he do? Has he ever been identified with the trade-union movement?

Mr. BROWDER. He has, for the most of his life, been a trade-union organizer.

Mr. STARNES. He has been a trade-union organizer in what union?

Mr. BROWDER. His first big organizing job that brought him into public prominence was organizing the stockyards union in 1918.

Mr. STARNES. What was his last job in that respect?

Mr. BROWDER. To direct trade-union organization; his participation in the miners' strike of 1934—was it, Joe? 1934, I think—no; 1932.

Mr. BRODSKY. 1933.

Mr. STARNES. With what union is he identified or affiliated at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know whether he has any union membership now, because he has been out of the industries for so long.

Mr. STARNES. He is a man of some years now?

Mr. BROWDER. He is in his fifties.

Mr. STARNES. Has he been, at one time or another, a candidate of the party in this country for President?

Mr. BROWDER. He was a candidate of the Communist Party for President in 1924, 1928, and 1932.

Mr. STARNES. Has he ever been on the international organization in any way, or attended world congresses at any time in Moscow?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes; he is a member of the executive committee of the International.

Mr. STARNES. And I notice you have yourself listed, and we have gone into your history from the party standpoint rather fully.

Mr. BROWDER. I think you must know me rather well now.

Mr. STARNES. And Alexander Bittelman—by the way, William Z. Foster and Earl Browder are also members of your Political Committee?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. That controls your political policies?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Alexander Bittelman; what does he do?

Mr. BROWDER. He is a writer and editor.

Mr. STARNES. Is he a member of any trade union?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not know that he is.

Mr. STARNES. Or any organization affiliated with any trade-union movement at all?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not think so. He is a journalist, writer, and editor.

Mr. STARNES. He has never affiliated himself with the Writers' Guild, or any other organization?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know about that.

Mr. STARNES. He is also a member of your political committee?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Roy Hudson: Who is Roy Hudson?

Mr. BROWDER. He is a former seaman, a worker.

Mr. STARNES. Where does he live?

Mr. BROWDER. New York City.

Mr. STARNES. He is a member of your political committee, too, is he not?

Mr. BROWDER. He is.

Mr. STARNES. At the present time, he is in charge of organization work among marine workers, is he not?

Mr. BROWDER. No; he is what we call "industrial secretary"; that is, he gives attention to the problems generally in industries and trade unions.

Mr. STARNES. When did he cease his activities as organizer in any respect for the trade-union movement?

Mr. BROWDER. It has been several years.

Mr. STARNES. Two years?

Mr. BROWDER. More. I could not give you the exact time when he was last organizer of trade unions.

Mr. STARNES. He is no longer connected at all with the marine workers, or plays any part in that?

Mr. BROWDER. I am sure he is closely connected with the marine workers. He would be a very strange person if he were not.

Mr. STARNES. I want to know something of what the man does. If he is not an organizer, I want to know what he does. That is what I mean.

Mr. BROWDER. His duties in the party are, in general, the examination of industrial and trade union problems.

Mr. STARNES. To what union does he belong or is he affiliated with?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know. I am not sure he is a member of a union.

Mr. STARNES. Was he present in the strike situation on the Pacific coast, in the general strike that was called out there in recent years?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't think he was. I myself made a brief visit to California in the period of the general strike in 1934. I don't think Hudson was out there then.

Mr. STARNES. Was Hudson at Detroit at any time during 1937—during that period of industrial unrest?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know.

Mr. STARNES. I think you admitted during that time you were in Detroit.

Mr. BROWDER. Every year I travel from end to end of the country, and you will have to be more specific in your question if you want to get a direct answer.

Mr. STARNES. You know, of course, about the time and during the period of the year when there was industrial unrest in the Detroit area.

Mr. BROWDER. You mean the automobile strikes?

Mr. STARNES. The automobile strikes.

Mr. BROWDER. I was not in the automobile area during the strike period.

Mr. STARNES. At any time?

Mr. BROWDER. No; not during the strike period.

Mr. STARNES. Not during the strike period?

Mr. BROWDER. I often visit Detroit—

Mr. STARNES. Were you there before the strike period of 1937?

Mr. BROWDER. Some time before. I had a public meeting there in 1936.

Mr. STARNES. To what union did Roy Hudson belong—the Maritime Union?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. That is affiliated with the C. I. O., is it not?

Mr. BROWDER. He belonged to the union that had a different name from the present Maritime Union. The present Maritime Union is an amalgamation of several unions, including the one Hudson belonged to.

Mr. STARNES. And they are affiliated?

Mr. BROWDER. It is an amalgamated union, largely a concentration, that is affiliated with the C. I. O.

Mr. STARNES. After Roy Hudson comes this Jack Stachel. Identify him for us, please.

Mr. BROWDER. He is executive secretary of the party.

Mr. STARNES. He is on the central committee?

Mr. BROWDER. He is on the central committee.

Mr. STARNES. And also on the political committee?

Mr. BROWDER. And also on the political committee.

Mr. STARNES. Now, what type of work is he engaged in?

Mr. BROWDER. General executive work in the office.

Mr. STARNES. Insofar as his background is concerned, has he been identified with trade unions, or trade-union work in any way?

Mr. BROWDER. He was at one time secretary of the Trade Union Unity League.

Mr. STARNES. All right; now to what particular branch did he belong or in what particular industry did he work?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't think he has specialized in work in any one particular industry.

Mr. STARNES. Is he affiliated in any manner with the C. I. O. at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. No; he is not.

Mr. STARNES. Has he ever been used as an organizer—

Mr. BROWDER. He has not.

Mr. STARNES. By any labor organizations?

Mr. BROWDER. He has never been employed by the unions since 1934 or 1935.

Mr. STARNES. Now James W. Ford?

Mr. BROWDER. James W. Ford was the Communist Party candidate for Vice President in 1932 and 1936. He is one of the leading Negroes of our party.

Mr. STARNES. He is a member of the Central Committee and also a member of your political committee?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Has he ever been engaged in trade-union activities in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. I could not say—not in recent years.

Mr. STARNES. Well, what was his work; what type of work was he engaged in prior to the time he gave so much of his time, we will say, to the activities of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he was a post-office clerk.

Mr. STARNES. He was a post-office clerk?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Charles Krumbein: He is a member of your Central Committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And also of your political committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And State secretary for the State of New York?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And has he been identified in the trade-union movement in any way?

Mr. BROWDER. He is an active trade unionist over many years.

Mr. STARNES. To what union did he belong?

Mr. BROWDER. The steamfitters' union.

Mr. STARNES. The steamfitters' union?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. With what national or international organization are they affiliated at the present time?

Mr. BROWDER. They are a member of the A. F. of L.

Mr. STARNES. They are a member of the A. F. of L.?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Now, is this the man he testified to about being convicted under a false passport?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the man.

Mr. STARNES. Is this the man who was convicted for using false passports?

Mr. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. And one of the founders of the party in this country?

Mr. BROWDER. He is.

Mr. STARNES. Clarence A. Hathaway: He is editor of the Daily Worker?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And he is a member of the Central Committee and of the political committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Of the political committee.

Mr. STARNES. Of the political committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Was he ever identified in any way with the trade-union movement? The reason I am asking these questions is I want to get the background of the men. I want to know whether they are school teachers, preachers, doctors, or what they are.

Mr. BROWDER. He is a trade unionist, active in the Machinists' Union over many years.

Mr. STARNES. With what organization is he affiliated, internationally?

Mr. BROWDER. He is not in trade-union work now; he has been out of trade unions for some years. He is an editor.

Mr. STARNES. I see.

Mr. BROWDER. His trade-union experience being years ago.

Mr. STARNES. That is when they had only one large union in the country?

Mr. BROWDER. He is not now.

Mr. STARNES. Israel Amter: He is a member of the Central Committee and State organizer for the State of New York?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. What is his background with reference to his work; not what he is working at now?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he was originally a musician.

Mr. STARNES. He was originally a musician?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You do not know what he belongs to now in the way of an organization?

Mr. BROWDER. I only know about his party work.

Mr. STARNES. What about James W. Ford's party work? Let us jump back to party work.

Mr. BROWDER. He is secretary and the active director of the party organization of Harlem, New York City.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, he is in charge of your work with the Negroes of this country?

Mr. BROWDER. In Harlem.

Mr. STARNES. Stachel is in charge of trade-union work; is that right?

Mr. BROWDER. No; he is a general executive.

Mr. STARNES. I see. Max Bedacht—he is a member of your Central Committee?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And he is the national secretary of the International Workers' Order?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Is that affiliated with any other organization?

Mr. BROWDER. It is not.

Mr. STARNES. What type of work does he do—just general secretarial work for the party and for this organization?

Mr. BROWDER. He does no particular work for the party. He has concentrated exclusively on his position in his practical work for the International Workers' Order: general secretarial work. The office has a very strict legal responsibility, which takes all of his time.

Mr. STARNES. William W. Weinstone—what is his official position in the party?

Mr. BROWDER. He is an employee of the Central Committee—the national committee.

Mr. STARNES. And also State secretary of the party for the State of Michigan, is he not?

Mr. BROWDER. Formerly. He has been out of there for some time now.

Mr. STARNES. Does he belong to any trade union?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know whether he does or not; not to my knowledge.

Mr. STARNES. You don't know anything about his belonging to a union in the automobile workers out there in the Detroit area?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe he does not.

Mr. STARNES. You believe he does not?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. What about Bill Gebert?

Mr. BROWDER. B. K. Gebert?

Mr. STARNES. Yes; what does he do?

Mr. BROWDER. He is an organizer—

Mr. STARNES. He is an organizer, and what other work does he do?

In other words, is he a preacher, a lawyer—

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. A doctor, or an industrial worker?

Mr. BROWDER. Originally he is a miner.

Mr. STARNES. Originally he is a miner?

Mr. BROWDER. He has been working for the party for many years.

Mr. STARNES. What about Wyndham Mortimer? He is a member of the National Committee?

Mr. BROWDER. He is not.

Mr. STARNES. He is a member of the party, is he not? Is he a member of the party?

Mr. BROWDER. I am not sure. He is a very close friend, at least.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is not he a member of the party under the name of Baker?

Mr. BROWDER. No. That is misinformation. I have met him and talked with him and never raised the question whether he was a party member or not.

Mr. STARNES. Robert Hall—who is he?

Mr. BROWDER. He is secretary of the party in Alabama.

Mr. STARNES. Where is he located?

Mr. BROWDER. Birmingham.

Mr. STARNES. Did he have anything to do with the Southern Welfare Conference down there?

Mr. BROWDER. I think he attended it.

Mr. STARNES. Did you attend it, too?

Mr. BROWDER. I did not—I am sorry.

Mr. STARNES. Did you send a representative to it?

Mr. BROWDER. No; I did not.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know of Benjamin—Herbert Benjamin?

Mr. BROWDER. I know Herbert Benjamin.

Mr. STARNES. Is he a Communist?

Mr. BROWDER. He is.

Mr. STARNES. Does he hold any official position in the party of any kind?

Mr. BROWDER. He is a member of the national committee.

Mr. STARNES. He attended that conference, too, didn't he?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know.

MR. STARNES. Don't you know he is listed as one of those delegates who attended?

MR. BROWDER. I do not deny he was there; I simply say I am not familiar with all of those details and I cannot say positively. You know more about it than I do; I see you have studied it; I have not had an opportunity.

MR. STARNES. Mr. Benjamin is one of those southerners from New York City, is that the idea, that attended the conference?

MR. BROWDER. He is a resident of Washington.

MR. BRODSKY. I might say, Mr. Congressman, that Mr. Browder is a southerner. Way back in 1500 his family settled in Alabama.

THE CHAIRMAN. They came over on the *Mayflower*?

MR. BRODSKY. Yes.

MR. STARNES. I thought he told me he came from New York.

MR. BROWDER. My family originated in Virginia. They built the Methodist Church in Virginia.

THE CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, the record heretofore gives the identity and the history of each and every one of those parties?

MR. STARNES. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. There is one question I want to ask, if I may, Mr. Browder, and the reason I ask it is because of the charge that has been made generally over the country, that has had widespread credence or, rather, many people apparently have believed it, and it seems to be systematically spread over the country, and that is this, that "communism" is synonymous with "Jews"; that the Jews are predominant in the Communist movement in the United States. Constantly that charge is made, that in the parades in New York City, in Chicago, and elsewhere the Jews are in the leadership and are prominent in the movement, and so on, et cetera. You know that is being used by a great many organizations?

MR. BROWDER. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. And many of them, in my judgment, are purely Fascist organizations—if there can be any such thing as a Fascist organization.

MR. BROWDER. Yes; I am familiar with that.

THE CHAIRMAN. What I mean is organizations like the Silver Shirts, Deatherage, and that group. I want you to tell the committee, so that it can be of record, what are the facts with reference to that in the Communist Party?

MR. BROWDER. The whole business is utter nonsense. It is merely an exhibition of the attempt to direct the sentiment of those who are against communism—to direct them against the Jews. This is one of the ways in which the anti-Communist slogan is used generally, to try to break up the unity of the people, to set one group to fighting another, and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN. But, getting down, what are the facts?

MR. BROWDER. You mean the facts about Jewish participation in the Communist movement?

THE CHAIRMAN. Yes; what is the proportion of Jews: of the 100,000, how many of the 100,000 are there of the Jewish race?

MR. BROWDER. Well, I cannot give you exact figures, but I would say that outside of New York City, where the Jewish population is quite large in the city, and is reflected proportionately in the Communist Party—

The CHAIRMAN. I am taking the Communist Party as a whole.

Mr. BROWDER. Outside of New York City there are very few Jews in the Communist movement of America.

The CHAIRMAN. Most of them are in New York City?

Mr. BROWDER. Most of the Jewish Communists are in New York City, with scattering groups in other large centers of population.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the 100,000, how many of the 100,000 are Jews, approximately?

Mr. BROWDER. Perhaps 2,000 or 2,500.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps 2,500 of the 100,000?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be no greater proportion than the total Jewish population to the rest of the people of the United States; it would be less?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I don't know the exact relation of the population, but the proportion is so small that it cannot possibly have any significance to anyone except those who want to make confusion.

The CHAIRMAN. I think this thing ought to be clarified, and you are the head, the official spokesman of the Communist Party; that is the reason I am addressing this question to you direct.

As a matter of fact, you have people of all nationalities in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. We have.

The CHAIRMAN. Practically all?

Mr. BROWDER. We have.

The CHAIRMAN. You have Negroes?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You have whites?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You have Chinese, Japanese—

Mr. BROWDER. We have a few.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a few, and you have people of all nationalities in the United States?

Mr. BROWDER. We have a larger proportion of the Chinese population American Communists than we have of the Jewish population; that is certain.

The CHAIRMAN. That is certain?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the Negro population?

Mr. BROWDER. I would say the proportion would be about the same.

The CHAIRMAN. So that is it correct to say that practically every nationality is represented, or, rather, has representatives, in the Communist Party?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir. With direct relation to their proportion to the whole population of the country, I would say we are still somewhat weak in the representation in our party of the Anglo-Saxon race.

The CHAIRMAN. The Anglo-Saxon race?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes. Twenty years ago, when our party was formed, the proportion of Anglo-Saxon in the party was very small indeed—1 or 2 percent. Today it is about half.

The CHAIRMAN. There are more Anglo-Saxons?

Mr. BROWDER. About half—40 percent to a half. But that still is not up to the percentage of the whole population of the country and

we are not satisfied in the composition of our party until it corresponds to the composition of the country as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. You say about 97 percent of your members are citizens of the United States, either native-born or naturalized?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What percentage of that 97 percent is naturalized and what percent is native-born?

Mr. BROWDER. I believe about 62 percent is native-born.

The CHAIRMAN. And the balance would be—

Mr. BROWDER. Naturalized.

The CHAIRMAN. The balance of that number would be naturalized citizens?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And of the native-born, would you say the majority of them are old stock like you are?

Mr. BROWDER. Not the majority; no, not the majority.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I believe you have already stated they represent practically every religion and every walk of life?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean the membership in the party.

Mr. BROWDER. The membership in the party.

The CHAIRMAN. And the same is true of your central committee; the nationality is pretty general; you have almost every race represented there?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right. Most of them are native-born, but the stock from which they come represents all the main groups that went to make up the America that was built by immigration.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. STARNES. How have you directed your activities in the South? I mean along what particular lines down there?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not understand the question concretely.

Mr. STARNES. Well, specifically, in what groups and classes have you concentrated your major effort down in the South?

Mr. BROWDER. We have given our major attention to the workers, and that means, of course, especially the Negroes, who are a separate group requiring special attention; secondarily, we have given attention to the sharecroppers; and, thirdly, we have given some attention, but as yet of a minor character, to extending our contacts among the middle classes and professions. This is, of course, a relatively minor phase of our work. We are concerned mainly with workers, with some special attention to the Negroes and the sharecroppers.

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me, if I inject a question there. But, as a matter of fact, you have made it clear that since 1935 your party has made tremendous progress in the United States? Is not that true?

Mr. BROWDER. Relatively speaking; relatively speaking.

The CHAIRMAN. You feel that that progress will be greater in the future?

Mr. BROWDER. I hope so. I will do everything possible to make that true.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. STARNES. Along what line has your chief activity been on the west coast?

Mr. BROWDER. Again I would say—

Mr. STARNES. Just be specific like you did with the South. I want to know in what group and what classes.

Mr. BROWDER. In what groups of population?

Mr. STARNES. That is right.

Mr. BROWDER. Primarily the industrial workers; secondarily in the farming communities.

Mr. STARNES. What particular group out there in the farming communities?

Mr. BROWDER. Well, of course, in approaching farmers, we always give first attention to the farm workers, to the agricultural wage workers. But, besides that, we always find it possible, when we give attention to it by consistent work, to establish contacts with the poorer strata of the farming population.

Mr. STARNES. What about your maritime workers out there?

Mr. BROWDER. The maritime workers, of course, are among the first in the industrial workers.

Mr. STARNES. I see; they are classed as industrial workers?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. What about those lumber people out there?

Mr. BROWDER. The lumber people we try to give a lot of attention to, although our work among them is more difficult, because they are spread out more. Our particular type of work is facilitated by the concentration in large centers of population.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. BROWDER. As it is spread out, our work becomes more difficult.

Mr. STARNES. I see. So your chief activities, then, might be said to center around Los Angeles, which is the largest metropolitan area on the coast, San Francisco, Portland, and the Seattle area?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Now, what groups have you been particularly active among in and around Los Angeles?

Mr. BROWDER. Los Angeles?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. BROWDER. I would not be able to name any particular group. There is a large working class there, but it is more diversified.

Mr. STARNES. I see. Now name some of those in which you have been particularly active out there in that diversified group.

Mr. BROWDER. Well, I could not name any particular ones.

Mr. STARNES. Has any particular emphasis been placed out there on your drive to spread enlightenment and education along party lines in the schools and colleges in that area?

Mr. BROWDER. There possibly has been, but I have not been able to give personal attention to Los Angeles.

Mr. STARNES. Who is in charge of the Los Angeles area for you?

Mr. BROWDER. The Secretary of the Los Angeles County organization is Paul Kline.

Mr. STARNES. Paul Kline?

Mr. BROWDER. Paul Kline.

Mr. STARNES. Is it in Los Angeles or San Francisco that your paper out there, Communist paper, is at work?

Mr. BROWDER. The People's World that I mentioned yesterday is located at San Francisco.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know Harold Pritchett?

Mr. BROWDER. I know who he is; I don't know him personally.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know whether he is a Communist?

Mr. BROWDER. He is not.

Mr. STARNES. He is not?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know whether or not he is an American citizen?

Mr. BROWDER. I do not; no.

Mr. STARNES. You do not know whether he is a Canadian Communist, or not?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't know whether he is a Canadian, but I know he is not a Communist.

Mr. STARNES. This fellow Robert Hall you spoke of a moment ago, down there in Birmingham, Ala., went to Russia at one time to receive special instructions, did he not?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't think he did.

Mr. STARNES. Has he ever been to Russia?

Mr. BROWDER. I don't think he has. His education was in Columbia University.

Mr. STARNES. You say he was educated at Columbia University?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Did you meet him there?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir; I met him after he left there.

Mr. STARNES. Where have your activities been particularly directed in the Chicago area?

Mr. BROWDER. In the Chicago area, which is the general area included in Illinois, I would say we have given major attention to miners, steel workers, packing-house workers, and in heavy construction industries.

The CHAIRMAN. We will meet tomorrow morning at 10:30 instead of 10 o'clock. Mr. Browder will be excused.

Mr. BROWDER. I would like to ask that the committee permit me, in the interest of the objects for which the committee is serving, to prepare a statement giving the committee systematic answers to some of the more important questions that have been raised here, and which I have been able to answer only in the most fragmentary form.

The CHAIRMAN. We will not permit anybody on any side to prepare and file statements. Practically every witness requests that, and we have heretofore agreed not to have any prepared statements from anyone. That is because we have been asked the same privilege from all the other groups.

Mr. BROWDER. I think you will understand that it is really impossible to give a picture of the views of the party I represent from the type of questioning that has been had.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee meets we will consider your request.

Mr. BROWDER. I will appreciate it very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The policy we want to follow is to avoid those general statements, because we find that if the requests are granted some people will put in hundreds of pages.

Mr. BROWDER. I was thinking of 10 or 12 typewritten pages.

Mr. STARNES. Frequently those hundreds of pages are devoted to matters not pertinent to the inquiry.

Mr. BROWDER. I was thinking of a brief systematic review.

The CHAIRMAN. You may prepare it and present it to the committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder, you have the name of W. L. Patterson on this list. Is this Patterson the William L. Patterson who is a Negro?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is he not deceased?

Mr. BROWDER. No, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Browder, tell the committee whether or not you receive publications from other countries or other parties in which they deal with their activities or the work they are doing and whether or not you disseminate that information here for purposes of enlightenment.

Mr. BROWDER. Mostly we get information about other countries from news articles in our own publications. Besides that we also, in a very limited way, circulate some publications from other countries.

Mr. STARNES. Which are published abroad?

Mr. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Who pays for it?

Mr. BROWDER. Whoever is conducting the business.

Does the committee have a copy of the brief filed on behalf of the Communist Party in the case of Joseph George Strecker? If it is not in the records of the committee, I will be glad to furnish a copy of it. I think it will be of value to you to have it in your record.

The CHAIRMAN. You may leave it with the secretary of the committee.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 7, 1939, at 10:30 a. m.)

#### APPENDIX

##### ON THE USE OF "TRANSMISSION BELTS" IN OUR STRUGGLE FOR THE MASSES

(By C. A. Hathaway)

(Communist, May 1931)

"What is the reason that in spite of the fairly good response of the unemployed workers to our slogans, demands, and actions, we do not develop a real organized mass movement of the unemployed workers?

"Because we have no real organized unemployed councils. Our councils are too loose. Thousands and thousands of workers join and leave. No membership meetings are held and, because of this, the councils do not have any elected leaders. We have no functioning fractions in the councils. The party's guidance in the unemployed councils consists of nothing but one comrade bringing down instructions of the Communist Party to the unemployed workers." (From the March 26 organization bulletin of the New York district.)

This extremely sharp indictment of our unemployment work, presented in the form of a reply to his own question, was written by a leading New York comrade. It was written, please note, just 18 months—a year and one-half—after the outbreak of the present severe economic crisis which brought misery, hunger, and starvation to millions of American workers. It was written a month after International Unemployment Day (February 25) this year, the preparations for which should have marked a decisive change for the better in our work among the unemployed.

Was this comrade mistaken in his indictment? Did he paint too gloomy a picture? In the main, I think not. With a few rare exceptions, here and there, his statements are correct. We have not yet real, organized unemployed councils. Those that we have—again with a few exceptions—function too loosely, without regular membership meetings, without real leadership, without party fractions, and without real party guidance and direction.

Is this state of affairs confined to the New York district of which this comrade wrote? I think not. Reports from Pittsburgh, Detroit, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and elsewhere indicate that this is quite a general situation. They indicate that the localities which can boast of well functioning councils that lead broad mass movements of unemployed workers are still decidedly scarce.

## ANSWER NEEDED FOR WHOLE PARTY

The question raised by the comrade writing in the New York organization bulletin must be quite fully answered, therefore, not only for New York, but for the whole party.

"What is the reason that in spite of the fairly good response of the unemployed workers to our slogans, demands, and actions, we do not develop a real organized mass movement of the unemployed workers?"

The comrade, not incorrectly when his purpose is considered, placed the emphasis, in replying, on our organizational shortcomings.

There are, of course, also serious political shortcomings—too general slogans, working out of slogans without consultation with the workers, insufficient attention to local issues of vital concern to the unemployed, weak and unsystematic exposures of the charity organizations and of the demagogic of the bourgeoisie and reformists, insufficient continuity and persistence in our work, failure in time to see the need for directly undertaking relief in acute cases of suffering, bureaucratic tendencies and failure to develop the initiative of the workers themselves, many opportunist conceptions of both the "right" and "left" variety and so forth. These, together with the organizational shortcomings enumerated in the bulletin, are certainly very major reasons for our failure to develop "a real organized mass movement of the unemployed workers."

But there is still a most vital question to be answered!

Why, after a year and one-half of acute unemployment, during which time we have repeatedly pointed out and attempted to correct most of these weaknesses and shortcomings, have we not made greater progress on the road toward self-correction?

Without answering this question, any effort to solve either the organizational or political shortcomings enumerated becomes mere patchwork. And the answer to this question raises basic problems for the party. It raises problems which concern not only the work among the unemployed but also every other field of work. The same question could be put with regard to our trade-union work, our Negro work, and so forth. Everywhere, in every field, we are face to face with the problem: Why are we only to a very limited extent successful in the development of broad, organized mass struggles against the brutal and vicious bourgeois offensive?

## SOME PROGRESS MADE

By putting the question so sharply one should not conclude that no progress has been made. Such conclusions could only be harmful to the party and interfere with the serious job of self-correction now ahead of us. In the three major fields of party work, unemployment, trade-union, and Negro, definite progress has been made, especially since the arrival of the latest Comintern directives early in February. In textile (Lawrence) and mining (Pittsburgh, anthracite) very marked improvement is to be noted. The character of the demands raised, the preparatory organizational work, and the conduct of the strike struggles in each of these instances show that the lessons of past experiences are being learned.

In a number of cities, notably the smaller industrial towns, unemployed councils have been established which are carrying on a persistent and effective struggle against unemployment.

In Negro work only now is the party really beginning to develop the broad mass struggle for Negro rights (*Scottsboro case*, Greenville, district 17, etc.), making this a part of the mass struggles against wage cuts and the speed-up and for unemployment insurance.

The most notable achievements, however, are still to be found within the party—stabilization of the party membership, increase in dues payments, improvement of the party composition, beginning of planned work, more serious consideration to our defects in mass work, etc.

These achievements, while still extremely limited, are particularly characteristic of only the past 3 months, are not yet common to the entire party, and do not as yet invalidate the following extremely sharp characterization of the party's work contained in the *Pravda* editorial. In the *Footsteps of Lenin*, of January 21, this year:

"The day-to-day work of the Communist Party of the United States of America still bears a purely propaganda character. The party has as yet come out before the masses only with general slogans, failing to concentrate attention on the immediate, everyday demands of the masses. The trade-unions have, in fact, only duplicated the party. The result of all this has been a considerable weakening of the party's contact with the masses, passivity, and lagging behind the general mass movement, and a consequent strengthening of opportunist tendencies, especially the right danger, in the various sections of the party" (April Communist, p. 296).

#### TO BUILD MASS PARTY IS PROBLEM

This statement, "The day-to-day work of the Communist Party of the United States of America still bears a purely propaganda character," brings us back to our basic problem. We are still a propaganda party; we have not yet become a Bolshevik mass party. The achievements which have been made have been chiefly of a routine character, i. e., improvements in our work as a propaganda party, but not yet the transformation of our party into a mass party.

Already in the Open Letter of the Communist International to our party in May 1929 and again in the Communist International address of a few months later, the urgent need for rapidly transforming our party from a propaganda party to a mass party was strongly emphasized. Since then, in one form or another, the burning need for such a transformation has been many times repeated. But we are still a propaganda party—and we proceed on the road toward becoming a mass party only at a snail's pace.

The reason—the basic reason—why we have not made greater progress during the past 18 months (the crisis period) in overcoming our weaknesses and shortcomings and in progressing more rapidly on the road toward becoming a mass party in the Leninist sense is because we did not fully grasp the significance of the change which we had to make. The membership was driven harder and harder; more work was done than ever before, but we did see the need of changing thoroughly our methods of work from top to bottom.

We accepted too much as a mere phrase the Comintern's directives without really considering in a concrete manner just what these directives meant. We proceeded with the best of intentions, but in a vague, groping, unplanned, and confused manner. We tried first one method and then another without clearly asking ourselves what we wanted or how we were going to get it. Phrases too often became a substitute for a thorough examination of our problems.

#### UTILIZE TRANSMISSION BELTS

##### What must we do?

In the first place, we must break definitely with the conception that Communist work consists solely in direct efforts to build the Communist Party and in recruiting new members. We must learn to set up and work through a whole series of mass organizations and in this way also develop our party work. Our chief error is our failure to understand the role of and to systematically utilize mass organizations (T. U. U. L., unemployed councils, I. L. D., W. I. R., L. S. N. R., etc.) as transmission belts to the broad masses of nonparty workers. The Communist Party is necessarily composed of the most conscious and self-sacrificing elements among the workers. These mass organizations, on the contrary, with a correct political line, can be made to reach many thousands of workers not yet prepared for party membership. Through these organizations led by well-functioning party fractions, the party must necessarily find its best training and recruiting ground. They are the medium through which the party, on the one hand, guides and directs the workers in their struggles and, on the other hand, keeps itself informed on the mood of the masses, the correctness of party slogans, etc.

Comrade Piatnitsky, speaking at the Tenth Plenum of Executive Committee of the Communist International on the methods of organizationally consolidating the growing political influence of the various parties of the Comintern, stated:

"How can the growing influence of the parties be consolidated? By good work on the part of the party organizations, by close contact with the masses. What is the best way of establishing this contact? *By Communist work in the workers'*

*and peasants' mass organizations* (factory committees, trade-unions, workers' cooperatives and sport organizations, I. R. A., Free Thinkers' organizations, W. I. R., provisional organizations, mainly strike committees, anti-lock-out committees), by the work of party nuclei in enterprises." [My emphasis.—C. A. H.]

Comrade Kuusinen, speaking on the organization report at the Sixth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, dealt even more fully with this method of developing our Communist work.

"The carrying out of the task of winning over the masses of the proletariat for the proletarian revolution," he said, "calls forth a certain one-sidedness among a section of our party membership. According to the view of these comrades, Communist work consists solely of building up Communist Party organizations and in recruiting new members. This is, of course, one of our fundamental tasks. *It would, however, be entirely wrong to suppose that it is fluence of our party (not under mechanical leadership).*" [Italics supplied.—C. A. H.]

#### A SOLAR SYSTEM OF ORGANIZATIONS

Later on, in the same speech, Comrade Kuusinen says:

"The first part of our task is to build up, not only Communist organizations but other organizations as well, above all, mass organizations sympathizing with our aims and able to aid us for special purposes. \* \* \* We must create a whole solar system of organizations and smaller committees around the Communist Party, so to speak, smaller organizations working actually under the influence of our party (not under mechanical leadership)." [My emphasis.—C. A. H.]

Finally, Comrade Kuusinen energetically opposed as a serious deviation the tendency to consider mass work as "not real Communist work."

"In any case," he declared, "we most energetically oppose that deviation which regards work among the masses and the organization of this work as being not real Communist work and considers that party work is only to be carried on in our own midst, while work among outsiders is of secondary importance. No; for the majority of the members of the party the main sphere of party work is the organization of the nonparty, syndicalist, and even social democratic workers." [My emphasis.—C. A. H.]

I have quoted at length to show, in the first place, that (to again use the words of Kuusinen) "the chief object of our attention should be the organization of the daily revolutionary detail work of every individual comrade among the masses." The work of our comrades and units must be conducted in such a way that everywhere (in the factories, among the unemployed, among the Negroes, etc.) we set up various organized groups under our influence and through which our comrades work. These groups, in turn, must be the instruments through which still greater masses of workers are organized for revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie. It is this principle of "transmission belts" (organized committees and groups—unemployed councils, T. U. U. L., L. S. N. R., etc.—under party influence) which must be firmly established in our party as the means for our transformation from a propaganda party to a Bolshevik mass party.

#### COMRADE STALIN ON "TRANSMISSION BELTS"

Comrade Stalin, in his Problems of Leninism, puts this need for "transmission belts" and their relationship to the party still more sharply. He says (pp. 29 and 30):

"The proletariat needs these belts, these levers [the mass organizations—C. A. H.], and this guiding force [the party—C. A. H.], because without them it would, in its struggle for victory, be like a weaponless army in the face of organized and armed capital. \* \* \*

"Lastly we come to the party of the proletariat, the proletarian vanguard. Its strength lies in the fact that it attracts to its ranks the best elements of all the mass organizations of the proletariat. Its function is to unify the work of all the mass organizations of the proletariat without exception and to guide their activities toward a single end, that of the liberation of the proletariat."

Comrade Stalin also quotes Comrade Lenin as follows: "The dictatorship (of the proletariat) cannot be effectively realized without belts to transmit power from the vanguard to the mass of the advanced class, and from this to the mass of those who labor."

From all this it is clear that the setting up, maintaining, and systematic utilization of such "transmission belts" are essential prerequisites for the transformation of our party from a propaganda party to a Bolshevik party of action. Yet, due primarily to a gross underestimation of the need for such organizations and to lack of knowledge of how to carry on general party work through such organizations (mobilization for May Day, the *Scottsboro case*, etc.), our revolutionary trade unions today are but little larger than the party, the unemployed councils are still extremely feeble, and the L. S. N. R., except in a few cities, is almost nonexistent.

#### CORRECT THEORY : WRONG PRACTICE

Many comrades may say that there is nothing new about this. Quite correct! This principle of organization is as old as the Bolshevik movement itself. Every leading comrade, at least, understands it in theory.

But what about our practice?

To again return to our work among the unemployed. Is this principle applied in practice? We will take our answer from the New York Org-Bulletin:

"We have no functioning fractions in the councils," says the comrade. "The party's guidance \* \* \* consists of nothing but one comrade bringing down instructions of the Communist Party to the unemployed workers."

Comrade Weiner, in his report to the Politburo on party work in the Pittsburgh district, also had the following to say on the work of the party there among the unemployed:

"\* \* \* The splendid fight against evictions reduced considerably the great number of evictions in that section [Hill district Pittsburgh—C. A. H.]. This result, instead of stimulating the activities and the building of unemployed councils, had the opposite effect. The groups were not provided with leadership, the party did not pay sufficient attention to the work of the unemployed councils and they gradually died out."

These experiences from New York and Pittsburgh are common to the entire party. During the past year, in every locality, councils have been built and rebuilt. In preparation for March 6, a year ago, councils were set up. They lived for only a few weeks. Before July 4 they were again established only to die out again after the Chicago convention. The same was true of September 1, August 1, and February 25. We have not learned to establish councils and then conduct both their work and that of the party in such a manner as to give continued leadership and thereby life to the councils. The same can be said with regard to our work in other mass organizations. None of them are systematically used to broaden the party's organizational influence and to extend the struggle against the bosses with all our forces.

#### LACK OF DIRECTION AND LEADERSHIP

Of course, the political and organizational factors cited at the beginning of the article are very major reasons for the weaknesses of the unemployed councils, but I am convinced that the major reason (which also is a direct cause for most of the other weaknesses enumerated) is the lack of real party direction and leadership through party fractions in the councils. This, in turn, is due largely to the fact that our comrades and the lower party units are not trained to make work in mass organizations such as the unemployed councils a task second only to the building of shop nuclei in the largest factories. One could go as far now as to say that there is an almost complete lack of contact between the unemployed councils and the party, and even between the party members and the unemployed workers. Certainly our party work is not planned in such a way as to regularly and continuously bring our members into association with the unemployed workers. With this almost complete lack of contact with, or knowledge of the day-to-day problems of the unemployed, party decisions are made and applied in the most bureaucratic and mechanical manner.

Comrade Bedacht, in reporting on the work in the Detroit district, had the following to say:

"The unemployed councils (in Detroit) lack a mass character and are not functioning bodies able to generate out of themselves through Communist initiative real mass action. There are one or two exceptions to this rule. One is the council in Lincoln Park, the other is the council in Port Huron. It is instructive to know that both of these councils are functioning in virgin territory and have a large percentage of native American workers in their ranks. I am tempted to

say that they function where there is no party to choke them to death. I am fully aware of the sharpness of this formulation, and do not want to have its meaning interpreted in a general manner. *The fact is that our party has not yet learned to function in a mass movement.* Our comrades are essentially afraid of the initiative of the masses. They do not allow an organization to function except on the basis of a preconceived plan brought down to them in the form of an order and usually drawn up in complete ignorance of local conditions, issues, and problems. Instead of inviting discussions and proposals out of the ranks of the worker, they stifle them." [My emphasis—C. A. H.]

Why is this so? Why do we have so little contact with the unemployed workers? Why do we have so little knowledge of their problems? Is it because of some personal traits in our party members? Certainly not! Why, even our unemployed party members are separated from the unemployed workers! It is due to the method of functioning of our party, to endless inner-party meetings, to the practice of developing our party activities almost entirely outside of and not through these mass organizations. As Comrade Bedacht correctly states, "our party has not yet learned to function in (and I would add, through) a mass movement."

#### TOO MANY MEETINGS

In fact, by our present methods, our comrades have little or no time for direct work among the masses. In New York, for example (and New York is no exception), practically every active party member spends all his time in meetings where good plans for mass work are made to the exclusion of all possibility of carrying out these plans. There are about 3,000 members of the party in New York. Of this number, according to the district organization secretary, there are 700 direct party functionaries, district, section, and unit, not counting auxiliary functionaries which probably number several hundred more. The following is their schedule: Monday, unit buro meetings; Tuesday, unit meetings; Wednesday, department meetings (Agit-prop, Negro, etc.); Thursday, school, union meetings, etc.; Friday, section committee meetings, street meetings; Saturday, free; and Sunday, week-end schools, "Red" Sunday (distribution of Daily Worker, and other purely agitational work). The section functionaries, usually the ablest comrades (in New York numbering about 80) as well as the district leaders, have absolutely no time for mass work. The unit functionaries, as can be seen from the above schedule, have not more than 2 nights, assuming even that the comrades must give 7 nights a week to party work, which in itself is incorrect. So from this it is clear that the entire "active" of the party is now almost completely isolated from the masses. Yet it is this "active" which must direct and carry forward the work of the unemployed councils, the T. U. U. L., L. S. N. R., and other mass organizations.

#### PURELY AGITATIONAL METHODS OF WORK

And then our methods of work are purely agitational in character. Speeches, pamphlets, leaflets, our press all call on the workers, for example, to join the unemployed councils. And as a result to quote again the New York Org-Bulletin, "thousands and thousands of workers join and leave." Why do they leave? Because, as our New York comrade says, "No membership meetings (of the councils) are held \* \* \* (they) do not have any elected leaders." And as Comrade Weiner from Pittsburgh says, "The groups were not provided with leadership!" Comrade Bedacht sharply declares that we "do not allow an organization to function \* \* \*." Obviously, then, it is chiefly criminal neglect of the most elementary organizational work that causes the workers to leave the councils. Or better said, our comrades do not know how to work in these organizations in such a way that both the work of these organizations and that of the party is carried forward. The result is neglect of the mass organizations.

#### FAILURE TO USE ALL FORCES

Our party members see this situation, but they plead a complete lack of time for this work, not to speak of energy. It arises, in my opinion, chiefly because we do not know how to use these mass organizations as "transmission belts" in our mass work. They stand in the way of our "party work"—

but only because we have not shown an understanding of how to develop effectively methods of party work, which permits a full utilization of all mass organizations and their members to strengthen the party's mass work. For example, in preparation for February 25, international unemployment day, all efforts were concentrated on work among the unemployed. Unemployed councils were for a time made to function. After February 25 there was a noticeable falling off in unemployed activity and a tendency to neglect unemployed work in order to concentrate on the factories. Now, in preparation for May 1, instead of continued energetic work either among the unemployed or at the factories there appears to be a reversion back to simply leaflet distribution and general agitational work. Certainly the preparatory work does not show increased organizational activity among the unemployed.

Comrade Johnstone, writing in last month's Communist, cited another case of "united front" activity which reflects very clearly our continued failure to carry on systematic and continuous work in mass organizations as a means of broadening the workers' struggle. He says:

"In New York City, quite a broad united front conference was formed by the T. U. U. L. and the unemployed council in support of the unemployed movement, but it never really functioned, never was utilized to a fraction of the degree that it was for \* \* \*. Again the party, instead of using party experience, party knowledge, party organization to broaden the united front, proceeded to substitute for it."

In the same way the party "substitutes for" the T. U. U. L., the unemployed councils, and other mass organizations, with the result that we tend to liquidate these organizations, and thereby seriously weaken ourselves, weaken our own organized influence among the workers.

#### BEST WORK IN SMALL TOWNS

Comrade Bedacht's observations on Lincoln Park and Port Huron, the only successful councils in Michigan, should be emphasized. He says: "It is interesting to know that both of these councils are functioning in virgin territory."

Most of our most successful unemployed work in other parts of the country is also in virgin territory. In addition to Lincoln Park and Port Huron, one can cite the examples of Chester, Greenville, Ambridge, and Reading. All of these places are new territories for party work.

#### THE READING EXPERIENCE

Reading is an excellent example of how "transmission belts" can be used. On January 28 the party there had 7 members, almost wholly isolated from the masses. There were no unemployed councils, no Y. C. L., and no trade-unions. Now, 3 months later by really concentrating on unemployed work, the unemployed council has 1,000 members with 600 paying dues regularly. A large portion of these are Negroes. Approximately 100 attend meetings every day and participate actively in every phase of the struggle for immediate relief, for unemployment insurance, and against the socialist party administration of the city. They have many successful struggles to their credit. Now, with the energetic aid of the unemployed workers who are members of the unemployed councils, the party fraction is developing the work among the employed workers in the factories. After only 3 weeks' work many contacts have been made and 2 workers from each of 6 shops have been organized into committees of the Metal Workers Industrial League—that is, a beginning has been made, with 12 members. This shows, how by working through one mass organization utilizing the forces there, who have been won for the party line in struggle, it is possible to extend the work of building other mass organizations which still further broaden the organized influence of the party. A unit of the Y. C. L. has also been organized with 4 members. And the party membership has increased from 7, 3 months ago, to 32 now. (These figures are only up to April 1; the number now is probably still greater.) And finally, the party is now entering the election campaign there with the endorsement of unemployed councils which are energetically aiding in putting forward the party candidates, securing the signatures, distributing literature, etc. From practically nothing 3 months ago, our party has become a serious political factor in Reading.

Could the same results have been accomplished in Reading if our seven party members (the size of the unit 3 months ago) had carried on their work in the manner of a New York or Pittsburgh unit (leaflets, street meetings, etc.) without having drawn in the nonparty workers into the unemployed councils and secured their help in extending the work? Obviously not!

#### WHY THESE SUCCESSES?

Why do we have successes in Reading, Chester, Lincoln Park, Greenville, and Ambridge, and much more meager successes in New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other old established party centers? Chiefly because the party work was carried on around and through the unemployed councils and the other mass organizations. The comrades there realized that party work was not merely agitation, but also serious and continuous organization work among the workers. The party, in these places, organized the workers in the councils: it gave constant attention to the councils; it drew the workers into the discussion of demands and slogans based on local issues (Greenville is an excellent example of this!) and into the preparation and carrying through of demonstrations and struggles also organized around local issues. These organizations and their members in turn were persuaded to directly aid the party, as for example, in the Reading and Lincoln Park election campaigns. Through these activities workers were organized, trained, and disciplined; they were taught to respect the party for its work; they were drawn into the party as members. And members secured in such a manner are better members for the party. They are reenlisted in the struggle, and not merely because they have listened to an agitational speech or read an agitational leaflet. These are the workers who will most likely remain with the party. In the old party centers there has been a persistent clinging to the old agitational methods, with no systematic continuous organizational work, no building and using of mass organization, such as was done here.

#### THIS IS ROAD TO MASS PARTY

From these examples, Comrade Piatnitsky's statement at the Tenth Plenum should become clear. His reply to the question, "How can the growing influence of the parties be consolidated?" with the answer, "By Communist work in the workers' and peasants' mass organizations, by the work of the party nuclei in the enterprises!" is proven to be fully correct by the Reading experiences, as well as by those in the other cities mentioned. And it is in this way—by building and working through the unemployed councils, the T. U. U. L., the L. S. N. R., etc., by building these organizations in the struggle, by recruiting the best, the most reliable workers for our party—that our party is to be really transformed from a propaganda party to a Bolshevik mass party. This is the only way that we can consolidate organizationally the increased influence which the party undoubtedly now has among the workers.

But as I stated earlier, the cases such as Reading are still the very rare exception. The weaknesses of our unemployed work are chiefly due to this fact. Such cases must now become the rule on a much higher and more extensive plane. The question is, how to accomplish this? How are we to quickly overcome the inertia of the past and rapidly develop these methods of work in order to progress with greater speed on the road toward becoming a Bolshevik mass party, capable of organizing and leading the everyday struggles of the employed and unemployed workers against the bourgeoisie for their partial demands, and utilizing these struggles to prepare and organize the workers for the struggle for power? In short, how are we to overcome our isolation from the masses?

#### WHAT IS TO BE DONE

Obviously this cannot be answered with a phrase or a formula. It will require much hard and persistent work to reorientate our party in this direction. Both the Central Committee and the district committees have the task of driving home the necessity of abandoning purely propaganda methods of work as represented by our almost complete failure to organize the hundreds of sympathetic workers around the party and of seriously taking up the rooting of our party in the shops and mines by organizing factory nuclei and groups

and committees of the Trade Union Unity League, and placing in the foreground, work in the mass organizations, especially the unemployed councils and the Trade Union Unity League.

#### USE THE MASS ORGANIZATIONS

The work of improving the functioning of our party, which certainly must be pushed, and the developing of our mass campaigns must be carried through with the clear perspective of improving our mass organizational work, especially in the factories and among the unemployed, and by utilizing to the maximum extent the forces, resources, contacts, and apparatus of the mass organizations (T. U. U. L., unemployed councils, I. W. O., other fraternal bodies, I. L. D., L. S. N. R., etc., as well as the local unions of the A. F. of L.) as the means of extending the party's organizational mass influence.

#### DIVISION OF WORK

A careful check up on all inter-party meetings must be made with the view of drastically reducing the number, this to be carried through in conjunction with the working out of a careful division of work and the assignment of our forces so that the overwhelming majority (at least 90 percent) of our members are carrying forward the work of the party through mass organizations.

#### REORIENTATE SECTIONS AND NUCLEI

The sections and nuclei must be made to realize that they are only successful in their work when they build around themselves basic mass organizations, much larger than the party, and through which the party fractions can work in rallying the masses for the struggle against unemployment, wage cuts, etc., and for the broader revolutionary struggles led by the party.

#### ESTABLISH WELL-FUNCTIONING FRACTIONS

Party fractions must be set up in every such mass organization and systematically guide their work. The tendency for the fractions to become outside bodies, giving instructions and orders to mass organizations must be overcome through the full participation of the members of the fraction, not only in making decisions, but especially in the day-to-day work of these organizations in carrying out these decisions.

#### SECURE REGULAR REPORTS

Higher party committees must insist upon and secure full reports from the districts, sections, units, and fractions on their activities, especially on work among the unemployed, the Negroes, and in the factories. And these reports must not merely be plans for work, but weekly statements of progress, the difficulties, the successes, the mistakes, and the experiences gained in carrying through the plans. Only by insistence on such regular reports can the leading committees really insure the carrying through of a line in practice that will insure our transformation to a Bolshevik mass party. The political mistakes of the past period, and especially of our failure to correct these mistakes, are due primarily to the lack of functioning fractions and of regular reports from these fractions and from lower units on our actual experiences in mass work.

#### LEADERSHIP CHIEFLY RESPONSIBLE

And finally it must be understood that the problems presented here are the problems primarily of the party leadership in the center and the districts. An army cannot effectively fight, regardless of the willingness of the soldiers, without a general staff which furnishes the various sections with a coordinated plan of advance. The same is true of our party. It is chiefly the task of the leadership to plan the systematic and rapid reorientation of the party toward real mass work in which the factory work and the work among the unemployed will be the central link. The leadership must overcome in practice the contradiction between party work and mass work by developing the plans for party work in such a way that party work will be carried on chiefly through the mass organizations of the workers.

# INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

---

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1939

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., in the caucus room, House Office Building, Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

Present: Mr. Rhea Whitley, counsel to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

The Chair suggests that with respect to this witness the members refrain from asking any questions until he concludes his testimony. As I understand, the witness wants to develop each point as he goes along and does not wish to be interrupted until he completes that point. I think he is right about that.

Mr. MASON. I think that should be the general method followed in developing the testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose that all the members of the committee who have questions make a note of them and give witness an opportunity to finish his testimony, unless there is some vital matter which comes up. Of course, you cannot lay down a hard and fast rule concerning all points.

## TESTIMONY OF BENJAMIN GITLOW, FORMER GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

(The witness was sworn by the chairman.)

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your full name?

Mr. GITLOW. Benjamin Gitlow.

Mr. WHITLEY. Gitlow?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where were you born, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. GITLOW. Elizabethport, N. J.

Mr. WHITLEY. Elizabethport, N. J.?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you a resident and in business for yourself in New York?

Mr. GITLOW. I am.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you at present have any connection with any political group or organization of any kind?

Mr. GITLOW. I have not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, are you in favor of trade-union organizations?

Mr. GITLOW. I have been in favor of trade unions all of my life, and I started my activities in the labor movement by organizing a trade union.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you state for the committee your political connections and activities in the past?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, my political activities began when I was 18 years old, 1910, when I joined the Socialist Party of the United States.

I became a very active member in the Socialist Party and was elected to the New York State Legislature in 1917 and served during the year 1918.

In 1919 I became active in the left wing of the Socialist Party, which was a revolutionary branch of the Socialist Party and disagreed with the conservative policies of the leadership at that time in control of the Socialist Party.

I became one of the leaders of the left wing of the Socialist Party and the publication which the left wing published, the Revolutionary Age, played an important role in its publication, and in the Voice of Labor, another organ, I played an important role in that organ also.

I collaborated with John Reed, the famous author and journalist, who died in Moscow in 1920 or 1921—I think it was 1920.

The left wing became the organization that organized the Communist Party in the United States as a result of a split in the Socialist Party. The group which I belonged to at that time had a disagreement with the Russian element in the left wing who had attempted to dominate the Communist movement from the very start. As a result of that, two Communist parties merged in 1919, in the beginning of September. One was the Communist Party of America, which was dominated by the expelled Russians of the Socialist Party, and the other was the Communist Labor Party, which I, together with John Reed, led.

Right after the conventions in September 1919 the two Communist organizations in America rushed representatives to Moscow to get official recognition by the Communist International and to get recognition from the Bolshevik leaders in Moscow.

John Reed went for the Communist Labor Party and Louis Fraina, the other, for the Communist Party of America.

In Moscow both parties were recognized as Communist parties and the Moscow leadership urged the unification of both parties into a common political party.

In 1919, you will recall, in New York State, a committee was organized known as the Lusk committee, which was investigating radical activities in the State of New York, and the Lusk committee conducted a number of raids on Communist Party headquarters and during a raid I was arrested and was the first Communist in the United States tried for being a Communist and sent to prison because I maintained my belief in Communist principles.

After serving my prison term—I was in prison for approximately 3 years and pardoned by Governor Smith in 1925, I believe, and I had been, a part of that time, out of prison pending appeal—and in 1922, during my freedom from prison and after I was pardoned, I was always active in the Communist movement and always held one of the leading positions in that movement.

I was always a member of the Central Executive Committee; was a member of the secretariat; ran for public office for the party, important public offices. Held important offices in the trade union and other activities of the organization and was highly publicized by the Communist Party press.

My first trip to Moscow was in the year 1927. I was called to Moscow following the death of Ruthenberg, who was general secretary of the party, by a cable which was sent to the American party insisting that I come to Moscow.

I was practically the only important party leader who had not been in Moscow. The cable which was sent to the American party instructed them that under all circumstances I was to proceed to Moscow, by Nicholas Bukharin, who was chairman of the Communist International.

From that date on I held the highest positions in the Communist International organization. I served on its executive committee. I was a member of its Presidium, its leading ruling body, and I was also a member of the executive committee of the Red International of the Trade Union, the international trade-union organization of the Communist International.

In other words, I have served the Communist movement as a top leader and not as a rank-and-filer from the very first inception of the movement.

I think that briefly states my connection with the movement, unless there are some questions you would like to ask.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just one or two questions, Mr. Gitlow.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you ever have any collaboration with Ludwig Martens, who was the first Soviet Ambassador to the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; and in this respect I would like to give a little explanation that will help you, I believe, to understand the Communist movement.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you go into that: As we develop the points, will you develop the fact that you were a candidate for Vice President of the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. In 1924 and 1928.

The CHAIRMAN. In both years you were candidate of the Communist Party for Vice President?

Mr. GITLOW. For Vice President.

The CHAIRMAN. I just wanted to develop that point in this connection.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with the background of your political connections. Very well, continue.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is the explanation with reference to your contact with Martens pertinent at this time, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, it may come up a little later on.

Mr. WHITLEY. Suppose we leave it for the moment then.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. While you were in prison, Mr. Gitlow, as the first Communist tried and convicted in this country for Communist activities, were any efforts made on the part of or by the Soviet Government to secure your release from prison?

Mr. GITLOW. There were a number of efforts made. One particular effort involved the exchange of American prisoners in Moscow for my release, and the Soviet Government made inquiries into that matter but failed to get any satisfactory results.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. GITLOW. That happened in 1920.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, I understand from your statement that you were one of the founders of the Communist Party in the United States, and that from the very beginning, from the foundation of the Communist Party in the United States, you were a member of the highest governing body, which was the Central or National Committee.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. To be concrete I held the following positions: I was a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party; of the political committee, that is the ruling committee of the Communist Party, which generally has a membership of from seven to nine members.

Then I was a member of the secretariat, consisting of only three members, that handled all confidential matters of the party, also matters of policy.

I was also a member of the trade-union committee of the Communist Party, which handled all trade-union matters.

I was also general secretary of the Communist Party. I was general secretary of the Communist Party in 1929. I also acted as secretary for a short period in 1928.

Mr. WHITLEY. General secretary: That is the same position that Mr. Earl Browder held?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the highest executive position of the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And in addition to those positions which you held in the Communist Party of the United States you were a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And a member of the smaller ruling group of the Communist International, known as the Presidium?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; that is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to introduce into the record a few references that have been made to Mr. Gitlow in the official organ of the Communist Party, the Daily Worker, just by way of establishing his connection with the party.

Here is a front-page picture of Mr. Gitlow, in the issue of October 27, 1928, of the Daily Worker, in connection with his candidacy on the Communist ticket for Vice President of the United States.

Another issue of the Daily Worker of May 1928 headline, Foster-Gitlow. That has to do with information of the party for the position of President and Vice-President, respectively, on the Communist ticket.

Here is a photostat copy of a page from the Daily Worker, dated September 29, 1928. It has an advertisement in here with reference to the election campaign subscription drive for new readers for the Daily Worker. Mr. Gitlow's picture appears in conjunction with that item, apparently for no other purpose than the fact that he





94931--40 (Face p. 4533)

was a candidate, and his popularity in the party was such that his picture appeared in conjunction with the drive as an impetus to secure new readers.

Here is a photostat copy of the Daily Worker, dated June 26, 1928, containing Mr. Gitlow's acceptance speech as a candidate.

A photostate copy taken from the Daily Worker of August 30, 1924, containing a photograph of Mr. Gitlow, in connection with his Vice President candidacy.

Another headline from the Daily Worker of August 20, 1928: "Gitlow Defies Terror, Speaks at Phoenix, Ariz."

Another page from the Daily Worker of October 13, 1928, headline, "Terror Against Gitlow."

Here is another page from the Daily Worker of October 15, 1928.

Another photograph of Mr. Gitlow in conjunction with that front page Daily Worker of October 16, 1928, headed "Gitlow Evades Kidnappers and Will Face Arizona Terror. Communist Speaks at Houston, Tex., Despite Police Who Raid Meeting Objecting to Negroes' Presence."

In addition to these photographic copies, Mr. Chairman, I have exhibited from the Daily Worker, I have here 10 or 12 typewritten pages of other headlines which have appeared in the Daily Worker.

The CHAIRMAN. Let that go in the record in connection with his testimony, but not at this immediate point, rather, following his testimony so it will not be interrupted.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What I have in mind is I do not like to have his testimony broken by a lot of document in advance of what he has to say further.

Mr. WHITLEY. Here are a number of pamphlets in connection with Mr. Gitlow's candidacy for Vice President on the Communist ticket; a picture of Mr. Gitlow and Mr. Foster.

Here is another Communist pamphlet, a circular put out to work and vote the Communist ticket.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have amply connected it.

Mr. STARNES. There is no doubt about the authenticity of these exhibits, is there, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. GITLOW. No doubt whatever.

Mr. STARNES. No doubt whatsoever?

Mr. GITLOW. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, why do you appear here as a witness today?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, my first real disagreement with the officers of the Communist movement, but not with Communism as a philosophy and as a political program, began in the years 1928 and 1929 when the Russian leaders of the Communist International indicated that they wanted to completely dominate the Communist movement of the United States and to disregard the will of the membership of the Communist Party.

However, following that break with the Russian bosses of the Communist International I began to review and to reconsider very seriously the whole question of communism.

In 1929 when I was expelled from the Communist International, I was also expelled from the Communist Party of the United States—I had not yet broken with communism. I believed, at that time, that

the Communist program gave us the answer to the way out of the bad conditions which resulted from the capitalist system of society. However, I sharply disagreed with the question of discipline.

The Communist Party and the Communist International is not organized on a democratic basis; it is organized on a military basis. The Communist International runs the world Communist movement from the top down. In other words, the leaders of the Communist International give the orders and the Communist Party all over the world must carry out those orders or be expelled from the Communist International, and the Communist Party of the United States, as an organization in this country continues that organization with its subordinate body of members. In other words, the leaders of the Communist Party make all decisions and these decisions are binding upon the members of the party. Once a decision is made that decision must be carried out explicitly: but before a decision is made some discussion may be permitted. But once a leader of the Communist Party made a decision that decision became law, became tantamount to a military command given by a general and had to be carried out or one had to suffer party discipline.

In breaking with the question of discipline I began to realize that in the question of discipline other matters were also involved and what was involved was the total lack of democracy in the Communist International and in the Communist Party.

At first I was of the opinion that it might be possible to remedy this opposition to democracy by reforming the Communist Party and the Communist International, by bringing about a situation in which the Communist Party would permit democracy in all its organizations.

I also maintained, for example, that if the Communist movement was out to establish socialism that it was possible to reach socialism, if that was the goal of the organization, the Communist movement, by a number of ways.

The Communists maintained that the official road toward socialism was the correct one, that that was the only road that existed, and for that reason they would not permit other parties to exist.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the only party in the Soviet Union. Its decisions are the only true, loyal decisions for socialism. Anybody who opposes those decisions becomes a traitor, becomes an enemy, becomes one who is opposed to the interest of the working classes which the Communists Party maintains it represents.

Unable to see the logic of this position I veered more and more toward the principles of democracy.

When Hitler came into power in 1933 I was of the opinion that this was an important historical turning point in the world; that if Hitler did have his way democracy in the world would be at an end and we would not be allowed to express our opinions, would not be allowed to stand by our convictions.

At that time, I did not as yet break with the philosophy of communism, but maintained that the Communist movement should become a champion of democracy, that the Communist movement should raise the slogan of democracy. I was attacked for holding this position; I was called a cheap democrat, a Menshevik, which is the worst charge that can be hurled against a Communist, and all the names that are common in the vituperation of the Communist Party. Later,

I broke with the Communist philosophy completely, because the cornerstone of Communist philosophy is the dictatorship of the proletariat, and once you accept the position that the world can be improved only by the establishment of a rigorous dictatorial regime, ruled by a few men on top—from that moment on I felt that all freedom, all liberty, was a thing of the past, and the very objectives that you were after could not be obtained. And so I broke with the concept of the proletarian dictatorship and took the position that if we are to improve conditions, if we are to improve the economic lot of man, if man is to enjoy more political liberties, if there are to take place worth-while social changes, those changes must take place under conditions which will guarantee to the great mass of the people more liberty, not less liberty.

I reached the conclusion that in order to obtain liberty and freedom and the democratic rights we now enjoy—and there is room for more democratic rights—that it took centuries of struggle; that men throughout history sacrificed their lives in order to obtain liberty; that liberty was something that was not abstract; that it was very tangible; and that once liberty and democracy were abolished despotism and everything that goes with despotism naturally had to follow.

The Communist membership and the leaders of the Communist Party, in my opinion, sincerely believe in their position. They take the viewpoint that the most important thing in life is to change the economic system, so that the great mass of the people will get economic security and will get in abundance the good things of life. And they hold that in order to obtain such a change it is necessary to have a firm socialist dictatorial regime which will be unscrupulous in obtaining its objectives. Such a regime we have in the Soviet Union at the present time, and the Communists of the United States and in all other countries are of the opinion that if the Soviet Union will succeed in maintaining its power and in socializing all economic life in Russia, that that will mean a victory for communism the world over. And everything flows, in the eyes of the Communists, from the Russia Revolution. Whatever Russia does, whatever Stalin and his leaders do to maintain their power in Russia, they do for the benefit of socialism, for the benefit of a better world. And they accept the leadership of Stalin in that light.

For example, Browder, or Foster, or Hathaway, the rank and filers of the Communist Party, are all firmly convinced that unless Russia can be aided to a successful conclusion of its experiment, everything achieved on the road to socialism is lost. But in recent years we have had an opportunity to see how this dictatorship of the proletariat works, which was instituted to free the working class and to improve the lot of the farmers, the actual workers. In Russia we have a dictatorial regime that enjoys more power than any other ruling government in the world, because Stalin and the small ruling clique around Stalin own and control and direct the economic life of Russia, the political life of Russia, the cultural life of Russia. In other words, what we have in Russia is a gigantic monopoly on the part of a ruling clique of all phases of Russia life. That is the dictatorship of the proletariat. In other words, they publish the newspapers. Only what they want goes into the press; there is no opposition press in Russia. They run the theaters; only what the ruling clique wants to be played is played in the theaters. For example, the Soviet Union

produced a number of anti-Nazi films. Now, since the agreement with Nazi Germany, an order has been issued that all the Nazi films be put in the archives, and they are not shown in Russia at the present time. You have this monopoly in Russia.

We have trusts in the United States—the Standard Oil Co. controlling the oil, and other utilities, other commodities; but, in Russia, you have one gigantic monopoly controlling everything and everybody works for those who run the monopoly. You have in Russia the complete form of monopolistic state capitalism, and the worker works for the state. He is responsible to the state, and if he breaks an ordinary working rule he breaks a rule of the state and becomes a criminal. In the United States, if a worker is dissatisfied with his job, he can take up his hat and coat and leave the job and, if he wants, he can find one elsewhere; at least he has that liberty. In the Soviet Union, no such liberty exists.

And has this dictatorship of the proletariat, this Communist regime in Russia, improved the lot of the workers in Russia? If anything, the lot of the workers in Russia is much worse than it was before the Czar. Wages, in comparison with living costs, indicate that the workers in Russia are exploited worse than in any other capitalist country. And, in addition to that, they have no liberties whatsoever. And the logic of this dictatorial regime finds its expression in the coming into power of a one-man leader, the one-man dictator, the Red Fuehrer of the Soviet Union in the personality of Joseph Stalin. And Joseph Stalin, in order to play the particular game of power politics, can do anything under the sun and the Communist Party, because of its concepts, because of the way in which it is organized, must support whatever position Joseph Stalin takes.

You have the latest example when the Soviet Union concluded a nonaggression pact with Nazi Germany. How can you explain the fact that the most important campaign of the Communist Party in the United States is the campaign to convince the membership of the Communist Party and to convince the people of our country the signing of the pact was in the interest of peace and to the best interests of the United States? You can take the files of the Daily Worker for years back and you will discover that every position taken by Stalin is approved automatically and defended by the Communist Party of the United States. Undoubtedly there must have been and perhaps still is a lot of disagreement prevalent in the Communist Party of America against the pact with Nazi Germany; but, as far as the Communist Party press is concerned, you will find no mention of it. In other words, the Communist Party of the United States carries on its activities in the same totalitarian way that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union does and gives evidence of its allegiance to the Fuehrer Stalin in practically the same way that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union does.

And with the developments in Russia, we have seen that Russia has proceeded to wipe out everyone suspected of opposition to Stalin, without any recourse to the simplest principles of justice. All that was necessary was to put the mark on an individual that Stalin was opposed to him, and that individual was forthwith done away with. So you found a situation in which the oldest leaders and the oldest members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were purged over a period of 3 years in the most ruthless fashion, and the jails of the Soviet Union are filled with Communists.

Keeping this in mind, I had for some time concluded that if we are to make progress, if we are to better conditions for our own people, if we are to live as free human beings, if we are still to enjoy democratic principles, it becomes necessary to reject in toto the Communist program and the Communist philosophy.

At first, I was not prepared to do so publicly. I was of the opinion that communism and nazi-ism—the one is brown and the other is black—are of the same cloth, and when the Soviet Government closed a nonaggression pact with the German Government, when it could collaborate on the most friendly basis with Nazi Germany, maintaining that the interests of the Russian and the German people would be served by such collaboration, when by its very act it hastened the outbreak of a World War, I concluded that as a former Communist, as one who has been active in public life, it becomes necessary emphatically to repudiate communism and to expose it for what it actually is.

Mr. MATTHEWS. May I ask one question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yesterday, Mr. Gitlow, we had introduced here a copy of the International Press Correspondence which carried a notation of your removal from the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. That notation also stated that a certain Randolph, from the United States, replaced you on the Executive Committee of the Communist International. The witness on the stand stated he had no idea who Randolph was, other than that he was Mr. Randolph. Do you know any other name under which this Randolph has gone?

Mr. GITLOW. I think Randolph was Robert Minor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You were there at the time?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I was there at the time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you know, of your own knowledge, that Randolph was Robert Minor?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was it common knowledge among leaders of the Communist Party of the United States that Randolph was Robert Minor?

Mr. GITLOW. I believe it was.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, you have never previously testified before any committee—public committee such as this; is that correct?

Mr. GITLOW. Just a moment on the other question. I was thinking over it. It may have been that the Randolph named had something to do with the Randolph that was sent over to the American party to become a member of its secretariat, and probably "Randolph" did not stand for Minor at that time; but if this Russian who was sent to America to become a member of the secretariat and to run the American party during the crisis—

Mr. MATTHEWS. But Robert Minor has been known by the name of "Randolph"!

Mr. GITLOW. According to my knowledge; I have a slight knowledge he was known by that name, but I would not be positive at this time.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, in the history of the Communist Party of the United States during the past 20 years do you know of any previous occasion when a former top-ranking functionary or official

of the Communist Party, and the Communist International, has publicly testified for the purpose of telling the truth concerning the objectives, program, tactics, and inner workings of communism?

Mr. GITLOW. To my knowledge, in this country, no.

Mr. WHITLEY. There has never been any previous occasion of that kind?

Mr. GITLOW. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And I believe he said he never did testify.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have never testified before any committee before?

Mr. GITLOW. Not in reference to the Communist movement; no.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, during the past 2 days we have had considerable testimony with reference to the finances of the Communist Party of the United States—

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this witness one question.

I notice you keep referring to the Communist Party of the United States. As I view it, I do not think there is any such thing. It is the communistic party of Moscow and this is a branch of that party; is not that the situation?

Mr. GITLOW. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is correct.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is no Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. WHITLEY. They identify them by the country in which the party exists.

Mr. DEMPSEY. They do that to show where they are residing?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is right.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But they are reporting to Moscow, and it is the Communist Party of Soviet Russia; that is what they are members of?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, not exactly so. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is part of an international Communist organization which it dominates, known as the Communist International.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. GITLOW. And the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a section of the Communist International, and the Communist Party of the U. S. A. is a section of the Communist International, and the Communist Party of Germany is a section of the Communist International.

Mr. DEMPSEY. All reporting to that one head?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, we have had considerable testimony in the past few days regarding the finances of the Communist Party. During that testimony Mr. Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States at the present time, which position Mr. Gitlow previously occupied, testified that, to his knowledge, the Communist Party of the United States had never received subsidies, contributions, or financial assistance of any kind from sources outside of the United States, specifically naming the Soviet Government, the Communist International, and the Communist parties in other countries.

In view of the importance of that particular subject and the importance of finances to the Communist Party, I would like at this time to ask Mr. Gitlow to describe to the committee the manner in which the Communist Party is financed.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, is it your contention that Mr. Browder perjured himself yesterday?

Mr. WHITLEY. I am not drawing any conclusions, but I would like to hear Mr. Gitlow's testimony with reference to the same subject.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; proceed.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you describe for the committee, Mr. Gitlow, the manner in which the Communist Party was financed at the time of its founding in this country and the manner in which it was financed as it developed and spread?

Mr. GITLOW. The Communist Party of the United States since its inception has always had a very loyal and highly disciplined membership; a membership which always responded very generously to the demands of the party. In other words, I believe that in no other organization will you find members who will contribute relatively as much as the individual member in the Communist Party contributes to the party organization. In other words, they have a large capital in this loyal and devoted membership which really believes that the Communist Party is out to better the world. At the same time, the Communist Party has a very extensive following—I would not say very large, but an extensive following—of sympathizers who are not party members but who agree with the party and support the party in its campaigns, activities, and policies. This membership is also, this group of individuals is also, very loyal to the party and contribute very generously to all appeals for funds which the Communist Party makes. In other words, the Communist Party can raise a considerable sum of money in the United States from its own party members and from its sympathizers. But its activities are so widespread and so costly that it is impossible for the Communist Party to maintain itself and to keep these activities going on the contributions it receives from its own membership and sympathizers.

The result is that the Communist Party's activities must be subsidized. After all, it has a small membership. Browder claims he has 100,000 members in the Communist Party today. I doubt that claim; while we have several hundred thousand sympathizers. But it is impossible for the Communist Party to raise from its members and sympathizers the money it needs to carry on its varied and extensive activities.

These activities have in the past, and, I believe, up to the present time, been subsidized to a very large extent by money received from Moscow in various forms and by the use of different methods. Even before the Communist Party was organized, when we had the left-wing organizations——

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the left-wing organization of the Socialist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Of the Socialist Party, which later became the Communist Party, we received support from the unofficial bureau of the Soviet Government in the United States, which was headed by Martens.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you mean financial support?

Mr. GITLOW. Financial support. After the two parties were organized, money was sent to the United States, not in the form of cash, because the Soviet Government at that time had no foreign valuta, but money was shipped in a different form. In other words, diamonds and jewelry were sent to the United States, which were sold in this country and thereby converted into cash which was used to support the Communist organization in America.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, those jewels were shipped in from the Soviet Union?

Mr. GITLOW. In 1920 and 1921 every representative of the Communist Party who went across returned with diamonds or jewelry in his possession.

Mr. WHITLEY. To be converted into cash for—

Mr. GITLOW. To be converted into cash for the support of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you, of course, know that as a result of your membership on the governing body?

Mr. GITLOW. Absolutely; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; surely. And, since that time, Moscow, through the Communist International, has been supporting the activities of the Communist Party. In 1921 a former Lettish member of the Communist Party of America returned from Moscow with a very large sum of money to accomplish a number of objectives. One was to support the newly organized Communist Party of the United States; two, he had money to try to bring to Moscow a delegation of American trade-unionists, who would participate in the first congress to organize the Red International of Labor Unions in Moscow; he had Russian money to facilitate the flight of William D. Haywood from the United States to Moscow; he had a large sum of money to help finance and organize a Communist movement in Latin America and in Mexico. That was in 1921 and 1922. Johnson was known under the name of Scott, as well.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is this Lettish member you are referring to?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; that is this Lettish member; and he became a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and a very active agent in foreign countries for the Communist International.

Later, however, when intercourse with the Soviet Union became more or less normal, money was sent to the American party in cash, through cables and by couriers, who brought it directly to America. For example, in 1922, when I was out of prison on bail pending appeal, we had a session of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party in New York City to consider the action taken by Lovestone and his advisers in converting American dollars at Moscow, supplied him for the American party, into German marks in order to make a profit on the exchange. Lovestone was advised that as a result of speculating on the money exchange the party could increase the money it received at Moscow by several thousand dollars, but the tip he got proved to be false, with the result that the party lost several thousand dollars. This was made the basis of the charges in the Central Executive Committee in 1922. Those charges were noted, but no action was taken against Lovestone for his speculation in marks on the money exchange. That incident shows that the party was receiving cash from Moscow for party purposes as early as 1922.

Mr. WHITLEY. You say it was from Moscow. Did it ostensibly come from the Communist International?

Mr. GITLOW. Ostensibly it came from the Communist International. The money is voted in the Communist International in the following way: They have a meeting of the executive committee of the Communist International at which requests for funds are made by various parties. They have a small committee that handles it, generally headed by Pianitsky, who is head of the organization department.

That committee brings in a report to the executive, and the executive approves the report. Then the money is voted, and it is transmitted to the various parties.

Mr. WHITLEY. You will show later on in your testimony where the International gets the funds that it transmits to the various parties?

Mr. GITLOW. I can show the measures or how they can get them; but since the money must be transmitted in valuta—how that is obtained, I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. I had reference to the relationship between the Communist Party here and the Comintern or International.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you develop the amount of money they have transmitted since 1922?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes, sir; he will cover that.

Mr. GITLOW. The Communist Party in 1922 obtained its largest subsidy indirectly from Moscow out of money which should have gone for specific relief purposes. You will recall the great famine in Russia in 1922, when the Hoover Commission was sent to Russia to relieve distress in the famine region. At that time, the American Communist Party, through a subsidiary organization known as the Friends of Soviet Russia, launched a relief campaign to raise funds for the famine-stricken victims in Russia. A large amount of money was raised. Over \$1,000,000 was raised through that campaign. This money was transmitted to the central bureau in France, in Paris, and this central bureau at Paris obtained receipts from the Soviet Government that it received the money for relief purposes; but the money never went to the Soviet Union. That money was kept there and was divided among the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries. As a result, a large amount of the money was transmitted to the American party.

Money collected for relief purposes through the Friends of Soviet Russia was retransmitted back to the American party to support its activities in this country. At the same time, the Communist Party used the relief organization set-up to finance its organizers and its activities in the United States. If the party found itself pinched for a few thousand dollars, we would call to the meeting of the political committee Rose Karsner, secretary of the Friends of Soviet Russia, to make a loan, and she would turn over to the party a few thousand dollars, or whatever the amount of money voted was, and would enter the necessary bookkeeping entries that would show that the money was spent for a legitimate purpose. At the same time we put a number of the members of the political party—I think Max Bedacht and some others—on the pay roll of the Friends of Soviet Russia. They received their weekly pay as organizers or propagandists, or some other activities of the Friends of Soviet Russia. They were not doing that work, but they were doing party work. If we had to send an organizer into the field, to raise his railroad fare and pay his wages while engaged in organizing work, we at the same time designated him as an organizer for the Friends of Soviet Russia. So out of relief money, he would be paid for work as an organizer.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say that the Friends of Soviet Russia, the organization you have just referred to and described, was one of the earliest or the first front organization of the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. No, sir; it was one of the early organizations, but not the only one. We had a defense organization of the Communist Party, and we had a Workers Party. That was at first the only front organization of the Communist Party. At the time that these relations existed between the party and the Friends of Soviet Russia, the party was denying and concealing the fact that it had anything to do with the Friends of Soviet Russia. At that time they maintained that the Friends of Soviet Russia was a nonparty organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. Entirely independent?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir; entirely independent of the Communist Party; but the entire leadership of the Friends of Soviet Russia, or the important leaders, were all members of the Communist Party, and they all took orders from the Communist Party, and every step in the campaign for relief was directed by a political committee of the Communist Party. The Communist Party at that time was an underground organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were a member of both bodies?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. We will go into the several front organizations later. You will continue, Mr. Gitlow.

Mr. GITLOW. The manner in which the Friends of the Soviet Union was utilized in obtaining financial assistance for the party indicates the general procedure which we followed toward all the organizations that we controlled or which we organized as front organizations. If there was a possibility through such control or through the front organizations to obtain finances for the party directly, we did so. You must realize that in the eyes of the Communists the party comes first. The highest conception of a Communist is the Communist Party. Everything is subsidiary to the Communist Party. The Communist Party in the eyes of a Communist can commit no kind of crime. It will be justified if it will benefit the party or the objective for which the party stands.

A big source of income for the party, or an indirect source of income connected with the Soviet Government, was the Amtorg, the Russian trading front in the United States. Those sent by Soviet Russia to open the Amtorg office consulted the party as to the personnel it should employ for the Amtorg, such as the typists, bookkeepers, salesmen, and so forth, because they wanted to make sure that in the Amtorg only such people would be employed as would be thoroughly reliable and 100 percent loyal to the Soviet Government.

As a result of the establishment of the Amtorg the party was able to place in the Amtorg organization several hundred party members. The jobs they obtained were good jobs, because the Amtorg paid very high salaries, and they were earning more money than they had ever earned before. The party members employed by the Amtorg were organized into an Amtorg group. That group was not a public group, but was a group which maintained contact with the national office of the party and with the district office in New York. The people employed by the Amtorg were instructed by the party to cease open public activities in the Communist Party. In other words, they were divorced from Communist activities in order not to involve the Amtorg with the Communist Party. At the same time this group was taxed by the party. They had to "kick in" with a part of their salaries to the treasury of the Communist Party. From time to time we would

impose a tax upon the group, and usually they would pay the tax. If they did not pay the tax imposed on them they might lose their positions in the Amtorg. That Amtorg group was a source of great revenue for the party. The Amtorg was a Russian organization.

When the Communists gained control of a trade-union, or if it controlled the officers of a trade-union, its executive board or treasurer, we would act toward the trade-union in precisely the same way as they did toward members of the Communist Party working for the Amtorg. Wherever it was possible to get any finances for the party directly out of the union's treasury, or through officials, or anyone who received a high salary in the union, it was done.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that often done?

Mr. GITLOW. Wherever we had control and could do it.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean that funds of the trade-union were diverted to the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Later on he will cover the details as to the trade-unions.

Mr. STARNES. Were all of the employees of the Amtorg, that he referred to, connected with the Communist Party in some capacity?

Mr. WHITLEY. Were all the employees of the Amtorg members placed there by the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. No, sir; all the employees of the Amtorg were not party members, but those nonparty members who obtained positions in the Amtorg had to be vouched for by the party as being reliable.

Mr. STARNES. Is that correct at the present time?

Mr. GITLOW. I would not be acquainted with the situation at the present time.

Mr. STARNES. That was up to what period?

Mr. GITLOW. Up to 1929.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of course, your knowledge of the situations and of the operations you have just described comes from the fact that you were a member of the political committee which was maneuvering the carrying out of the policies of the party?

Mr. GITLOW. I was a member of the secretariat which handled those confidential matters.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were one of that smaller group that handled those matters?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the witness able to estimate the approximate amount of money, during the time he was in the party, that was transferred from Russia to the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. I will deal with that more concretely later on, dealing with the definite sums that were contributed, and so forth.

Mr. WHITLEY. You will continue, Mr. Gitlow.

Mr. GITLOW. Another source of income, or indirect source of income, to the party comes out of its control of certain cooperative organizations. I refer particularly to the United Cooperative enterprises. The United Cooperative enterprises were engaged in running summer camps for workers, in building two blocks of apartment houses in the Bronx, and in running two stores in the Bronx to supply the cooperative houses; also, in running a restaurant for the tenants at Union Square, and in running a loan society.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the history of those enterprises?

Mr. GITLOW. The cooperative restaurant in Union Square gives a good example of how reckless the Communist Party was in the affairs of any organizations that it controlled. The cooperative restaurant in New York was a restaurant that was open all day, and was always crowded, because all the sympathizers who congregated around the Communist headquarters bought their meals at the cooperative restaurant. Yet the cooperative restaurant was wrecked and thrown into bankruptcy, and the directors and wholesalers who supplied it with material were never paid, because the party's practices wrecked that particular cooperative enterprise. One of the officials of the cooperative was a man named Obermeier, who is today a prominent official of one of the A. F. of L. unions, and one was Pollack, who was the manager of the cooperative. The party, whenever it needed ready cash, went to the cooperative restaurant, which, because of the nature of the business, had a ready-cash intake. The result was that when we wanted several hundred dollars or several thousand dollars, a note was written out with a letter from the secretariat, ordering Pollack to turn over the several hundred or several thousand dollars, whatever it was, to be repaid at some future date. Those loans were never repaid. Whatever the party took out of the cooperative restaurant was out of the profits of the cooperative restaurant, and it went out of business. The cooperative houses, with which I will deal later, will show how the party engaged in raising funds by which the workers lost, I would say, close to a quarter of a million dollars.

Another source of income for the party is connected directly with the Soviet Union. This indirect source of income has to do with the tourist agencies which solicit tours for the Soviet Union. I have in mind World Tourists, which was organized by the party as an American organization, but owned and controlled by the party. Whatever profits were made by World Tourists out of their business found its way in a large measure into the treasury of the Communist Party. They had friendly relations with the Intourist. The Intourist is a Soviet Government enterprise, and certain of those funds were diverted to the party, let alone the money that the party members paid to secure good jobs or positions in connection with it.

Up to this last year they have had a cooperative stationery business known as the Gensup Co., and if you would investigate that you would probably discover the hold the party has on that. The profits there are used wherever possible for party purposes. In other words, the Communist Party is so organized that it can enter into any kind of activity for the purpose of raising funds. It is not merely a political party, but its central committee can become a board of directors for a business enterprise and can direct a business enterprise for the raising of money. Everything is within the scope of the party and the party can use everything for the interest of the party, whether it is purely political or not.

Are there any other questions on this phase of it?

Mr. WHITLEY. I do not have any specific questions in mind.

Mr. THOMAS. You are to develop later the specific sums that have been transferred from Russia to this country?

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you plan to go into that now?

The CHAIRMAN. It is just a few minutes to 12 o'clock and we might take a recess at this time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the delegation that went from the United States in 1927, known as the trade-union delegation, that had an interview with Stalin?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you familiar with this pamphlet entitled "Questions and Answers of the American Trade Unions" and Stalin's interview?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. One of the questions which this delegation asked is found on page 44 of this pamphlet, as follows:

Is any money now being sent to America to aid either the American Communist Party or the American Communist paper, the Daily Worker? If not, how much do the American Communists remit to the Third International in annual dues?

The reply is lengthy, and I will give only the pertinent portion of the answer to the question made by Stalin himself. He said this:

The Comintern, being the central body of the international Communist movement, has assumed and renders assistance to the Communist Party of America whenever it thinks necessary.

Do you think that Stalin would recklessly make a statement like that?

Mr. GITLOW. Not Stalin. He is not in the habit of making reckless statements.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Again he says in the answer:

Indeed, what would be the worth of the Communist Party, a party which is in power, if it refused to do what it could to aid the Communist Party of another country laboring under the rule of capitalism? I would say that such a Communist Party would not be worth a cent.

From your experience, do you think that is in keeping with the party policy?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir. I might add a few words about that: First of all, the delegation which you referred to was financed, on this trip to Moscow, and this report or publication, or the publication of that pamphlet, by Russia. It was all financed by Russian money. It was financed by the Comintern. The Comintern is a big organization, and sections of the Comintern are supposed to participate in the expenses of the Comintern. There is not a single section of the Comintern outside of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which contributes a cent to the Communist International treasury. The United States Communist Party has never transmitted one cent to Moscow. The Communist International sends to America hundreds of thousands of dollars to finance the activities of the Communist Party in America, and it has sent millions of dollars to the Communist Party in Germany to finance the ramified activities in Germany. It sends money to the Communist Party in France, England, and other countries. In other words, all of the money to finance the activities of the Communist International itself and Communist activities throughout the world comes from that source. Russia is the source.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Russian treasury?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you personally acquainted with Joseph Stalin?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was during the period you were active in the Communist International?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

(Thereupon the committee took a recess until 1:15 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

The committee reassembled, pursuant to the taking of recess at 1:15 p. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. Mr. Whitley, you may proceed.

TESTIMONY OF BENJAMIN GITLOW—Resumed

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, in your testimony this morning—and this is by way of summation and recapitulation—you testified that the principal sources of income to the Communist Party are, first, from its members and sympathizers; second, from the Front Organizations and trade unions which it controls and dominates; third, from the Soviet Government organizations, such as the Amtorg, and others; and then directly from Russia, directly from the Comintern, which are subsidies.

Have you ever personally, Mr. Gitlow, participated in the transmission of funds from Russia to the United States for Communist Party purposes?

Mr. GITLOW. I have.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you relate the circumstances to the committee, if you please?

Mr. GITLOW. In 1928 I was chairman of the delegation to the Profintern, which is the Red International Labor Union, from America.

After the Congress sessions were over I received a cable from Lovestone directing that I come home immediately to be in time to attend the nominating convention of the Communist Party, which was to be held in New York City, and at the same time I should not forget to bring the consignment to the American party for the campaign with me.

I wanted to spend a little time in Soviet Russia in 1928; I wanted to see Leningrad and other places, but this cable from Lovestone made that impossible.

I was called in by the Org department and given my passports, plus a letter to take to the organization department of the Communist Party of Germany, and I was given instructions to make my trip as quickly as possible and to be very careful with the consignment which I was to take to the United States.

I knew that I was going to bring the consignment of money back with me, and had bought before I left for Europe a money belt, and I took a letter to the Org department of the German Communist Party when I arrived in Berlin to the department, and was immediately introduced to two Communists, who took me by circuitous routes to various parts of Berlin, and finally, at a given place I was handed in cash \$3,500 as the first part of a consignment of \$35,000 for the 1928 presidential campaign.

I brought that money with me—it was given to me in small bills at the time—to the United States.

Mr. WHITLEY. It was given to you in United States currency?

Mr. GITLOW. It was given to me in United States currency.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you brought that back and turned it over?

Mr. GITLOW. I turned it over to Lovestone, who was secretary of the party at that time.

Mr. WHITLEY. You mentioned the department that you received your letter from, Mr. Gitlow. What department was that?

Mr. GITLOW. The Org department. That is the organization department of the Communist International. They had a special department there which supplied the comrades with their passports when they were given permission to return to the various countries, gave them some money and whatever other instructions they wanted to give them.

Mr. WHITLEY. This \$3,500 you obtained from the party in Germany, upon a letter?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I did not obtain it from the party in Germany; the party in Germany only acted as a go-between. In other words, they were agents of the Communist International in Germany, but they had access to funds of the Communist International in Germany, and their movements were kept strictly secret and confidential, and the only way you could get contact with them was through the German Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was the first installment of a fund of \$35,000 which had been allotted by the Comintern for the 1928 campaign?

Mr. GITLOW. The presidential campaign of the party, yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was one of the campaigns in which you were the vice presidential candidate?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Were there any other instances, Mr. Gitlow, in which you have personally participated in the transmission of funds?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I would like to say before I go into the other, that I have a number of records of the transactions, and I want to give some documentary proofs of some of the statements which I made here today, and how other countries make, indirectly, their contact with Soviet Russia.

Mr. WHITLEY. Explain that, if you will, and it will be put in the record.

Mr. GITLOW. Then I will explain the documents. One of the avenues through which the party realizes money is by Soviet movie films, and I have here a letter of December 31, 1926, addressed to me by Ruthenberg, who was then general secretary of the party. He writes as follows:

I have your wire in reference to the loan and movies. I understood from Comrade Ballam that he was going to make the copies while he had the picture in New York. Why was this not done? Please pass this letter along to Comrade Ballam when he gets back and let him give a full report in regard to the \$5,000 proposition through which he got the picture from us.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you explain the connection of that letter with the transaction?

Mr. GITLOW. In other words, these pictures were assigned to the party. The party has title to these movies, and Ballam was to make arrangements whereby title would go to the party with this \$5,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, that was the intricate arrangement whereby the Comintern was to furnish these films to the party in the United States, and every dollar taken by the assignment of the bills went into the party treasury?

Mr. GITLOW. The receipts went to a certain film firm, the film to be sold outright and \$5,000 to go into the party treasury.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the name of that film company?

Mr. GITLOW. I do not recall, it was so far back. I have a letter on that item.

Mr. STARNES. Do you have any record or any data that might refresh your recollection, so you can supply us with the names of the films?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I could not do that at this time. All I know is that the films were to go into the party treasury to be utilized for raising funds.

Mr. STARNES. If at any time during the course of your statement you recall the names of these films, we will be glad to have those names as part of your statement.

Mr. GITLOW. I will see whether I can do that.

I have here—this is a document which was sent out by Rüthenberg and was to be kept in the strictest confidence. It says, "These instructions are strictly confidential and should be treated as such." It was sent to me as the party representative in the anthracite district during an anthracite coal strike in 1926, at the time it was claimed there was a closed agreement with the anthracite operators.

Involved in the instructions was what we were to do with the relief fund collected for the anthracite miners. It was independent of the union, and they had a relief committee, which was succeeded by the present relief organization, collecting funds throughout the country.

At the time they had some money in the treasury and the question came up in the political committee what to do with the relief committee, what to do in liquidating these activities.

Instruction 11, which has to do with all of the other phases of this problem, states as follows:

In case of a strike being settled, local miners relief committees to make public announcement that they are ready to return funds to donors upon request. (b) That they are ready to suggest that relief money collected should be used for the relief of Passaic strikers.

We ran the Passaic strike and controlled the relief committee in that Passaic strike.

Mr. THOMAS. What do you mean by the Passaic strike?

Mr. GITLOW. There was a textile strike in Passaic in 1926, which was initiated by the Communist Party directly.

Mr. THOMAS. Passaic, N. J.?

Mr. GITLOW. Passaic, N. J.; yes. The instruction goes on to say—or to turn over the use of the funds for the defense of the convicted Zeigler miners or any other working-class activities or agencies specified by the donor.

In other words, when we decided what agencies it would be turned over to we would give the Communist Party members a chance to be donors and make suggestions as to the use of the money.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is another illustration of the manner in which the Communist Party took advantage of the situation to set up front organizations to collect funds, ostensibly for humanitarian purposes, then use those funds so collected for party-organization purposes?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. I have here the minutes of the secretariat on July 2, 1925, in reference to the Purcell tour in the United States.

Purcell was one of the leaders of the British general strike in 1925, and the Communist International supported that strike fully and donated millions of dollars to the strike by taxing the members of their own trade union to supply these funds for the British general strike, and the coal miners strike which followed that.

Purcell, one of the leaders, toured the country. Arrangements were made by the Comintern to get Purcell to make this tour. All of his traveling expenses, all of the expenses of the tour were not paid for by the party or by the trade-union department, but the funds for the tour expenses were paid by subsidies which they received from the Communist International.

**Mr. WHITLEY.** That was a tour of the United States, a lecture tour?

**Mr. GITLOW.** That was a tour of the United States, supposedly a lecture tour, but it had as one of its objectives working for the recognition of Soviet Russia by the United States Government.

Here are the minutes, and they are very enlightening, on this tour, and give an insight as to how the Communist Party can engage in extensive activities.

The Purcell tours were a failure, not a single lecture turned out to be profitable, and the attendance was very small.

Here are the minutes on that tour:

Comrade Foster submitted the following plan for organization of the tour of Purcell in the United States:

"1. That we accept the proposition as received from Comrade George Hardy, who was the English representative of the party in Moscow, relative to the tour of Purcell in this country.

"2. That we make applications for meetings by Purcell in all the principal cities of the country, at least 16 in number.

"3. That we propose the tour to be handled by a routing manager who is a close sympathizer of the party and who shall be appointed formally by Purcell to handle his tour."

In other words, the party would actually make the appointment, but formally it will be made by Purcell, and it will be a close sympathizer of the party who will parade as a nonparty member, but who will take instructions and orders from the party committee.

I will continue reading from the minutes:

"4. Trade-union committees shall be established in all cities to organize the Purcell meetings. These committees shall be organized by the routing manager, who shall first send out circular letters to all the trade unions in a given city inviting them to send delegates to organize for the meeting. Arrangements shall be made so that our comrades fully control such committees.

"5. These committees shall be utilized eventually to build a left-wing movement in the trade unions. Just before the meeting is held in each city, the organizing committee shall be made permanent and given a left-wing program, important points of which shall be to fight for international unity"—

In other words, that the A. F. of L. shall combine with the Red International trade union, joining the two internationals—

"recognition of Soviet Russia, amalgamation, a labor party and other left-wing demands.

"6. Arrangements shall be made to have party and T. U. U. L. speakers at the Purcell meetings and to circulate our literature. In addition to the regular pamphlets, shall be printed a condensed version of the report of the British trade unions on Russia.

"7. We should propose that Purcell make at least four meetings per week and offer him terms of \$50 per meeting and railroad expenses."

In other words, Purcell got from the Communist Party, in addition to paying all of his expenses for his trip, the amount of \$200

per week plus railroad expenses. Then the minutes say, "Approved and carried unanimously."

Mr. WHITLEY. That is a copy of the official minutes of the secretariat?

Mr. GITLOW. That is a copy of the official minutes of the secretariat of July 2, 1925.

Now, I told you in this morning's session how the Communist Party has control of the cooperatives to obtain funds.

Here I have a letter which was sent to the Central Executive Committee of the party by David Siegel, one of the leaders of the cooperative movement in New York. I have this letter because I was put in charge of the cooperative department of the party by the Central Executive Committee of the party, and in this letter is the following, after he refers first to the situation in the cooperatives:

Financially the Unity Cooperative is still in a precarious state. This is due to the fact that during the past year this organization has done building (in camp) to the extent of \$100,000 without having the necessary funds for same. This undermined the sound foundation of the organization and caused a condition 2 weeks ago, when the entire undertaking was on the verge of collapse. It was only through what almost amounted to a miracle that I was able to avert it.

Then he concludes by saying:

That the party cannot figure on drawing material assistance direct from the organization and must definitely disapprove all attempts of various organizations for such help—

which is an admission on his part that the party made demands for money on cooperative organizations to the detriment of the cooperative organizations.

Mr. WHITLEY. He has just pointed out that, at least for the time being, due to the financial condition of that cooperative, it would be fatal to draw on it any further?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

Now, I also have here the minutes of the secretariat of October 8, 1927. There were present at that meeting, Lovestone, Foster, and Gitlow, and the only reference I want to make to these minutes is the fact that the secretariat of the Communist Party voted on October 8 that the Passaic strikers relief committee should turn over from its relief fund \$150 to the organizer of the International Workers Relief Committee—in other words, to divert the funds of another organization, which it was doing on its own authority, and had no authority to do it, and which the Communists, when they control an organization do through their officials in the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. This is a case of the highest governing body of the Communist Party in the United States ordering what is supposed to be an entirely independent relief group to turn over their funds to another Communist group?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. In other words, the Communist Party is organized on a military basis, and the general staff is the executive committee of the party and the commanders are in the political committee, and the ruling generals in chief are in the secretariat. If they make a decision, that is law, binding on every member of the party. If you happen to be an official in charge of a trade union and it has funds, and you are a Communist, you can dispense these funds; if the Communist Party makes a decision that you should turn over \$1,000 from the trade-union fund to the Communist Party, you must do it. But

you must find a way to make it look legal and plausible in the organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is up to the individual having the money to turn over?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. That could account for the manner and the method in which local-union funds were diverted in the Detroit automobile area in 1937, as testified to by Mr. Martin, the former head of the Automobile Workers of America?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, is the organization of international relief for workers known by the initials W. I. R.?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

Now, I have the minutes of the textile committee, the C. E. C. textile committee of March 11, 1926. I was chairman of that committee. In other words, I took charge of all textile matters, and it was the Central Executive Committee of the party, and here we have a series of motions in reference to the strike and the relief organization of the Passaic textile workers' strike in which they joined their relief committee to the workers' international relief, and our relief organization, the C. E. C. textile committee, made recommendations, and they proceeded and formed a joint committee of both, but the expenses were borne, not by the international but by the Passaic textile strike relief committee. In other words, the organization of the W. I. R. and the expenses involved in the work of the joint committee, were paid for by the joint strike committee. The international relief controlled the funds to be raised and at the same time had authority over the funds which the Passaic textile strike committee raised for the relief of strikers in that strike. But the general relief committee of the Passaic textile strikers had no jurisdiction over the W. I. R. funds, but the W. I. R. had jurisdiction over their funds.

These minutes deal with the intricate mechanism and work, which gave them authority to divert some of the funds to other purposes.

C. E. C. TEXTILE COMMITTEE,

March 11, 1926.

Present: Weinstone, Gitlow, Zack, Krumbein, Wagenknecht, Biedenkapp.

Took up the question of the I. W. A. and the Passaic strike relief.

The following motions were adopted.

(1) That the general relief committee for the Passaic textile strikers in the future continue its functions as in the past.

(2) That the I. W. A., jointly with the general relief committee of the Passaic Textile Strikers start a National campaign.

(3) That the I. W. A., together with the relief committee of the Strikers, form a joint committee. That new relief stations be opened in Passaic under the auspices of the joint committee of the I. W. A., and general relief committee of the Passaic textile strikers. That the joint committee shall consist of three members of the strikers' relief committee and two of the I. W. A. That this committee shall function on the scene. The Relief stations that will be opened in Passaic under the Joint auspices shall be managed by the New York section of the I. W. A.

(4) That the joint committee that has been announced between the New York section of the I. W. A. and the general relief committee of Passaic textile strikers shall be organized at once.

(5) That the expenditures for maintaining and conducting the relief stations that will be run under the joint auspices shall be through the general relief committee of the Passaic textile strikers.

(6) That all other organizations that desire to carry on relief activities for the strike shall, like the I. W. A., function through the General Relief for the Passaic textile strikers.

(7) That we recommend to the C. E. C. that the campaign for the relief of the Passaic textile strikers be the means for organizing sections of the I. W. A. all over the country.

BENJ. GITLOW,  
*Chairman, C. E. C. Textile Committee.*

(8) All the New York sections of the I. W. A. and all other sections that may collect funds independently of the national office of the I. W. A. shall expend the sum and shall transmit to the national office of the I. W. A. duplicate copies of all other financial transactions. — B. G.

MR. WHITLEY. That is another typical example of the machinery and the strategy through which the Communist Party handles situations of that kind?

MR. GITLOW. That is right.

Now, the Communist Party, when it was first organized was very sympathetic to the Industrial Workers of the World and was antagonistic to the American Federation of Labor. Lenin disapproved that policy and wrote a pamphlet called *The Left Sickness, or Infantile Sickness of the Labor Movement*, in which he fought against what he termed the policy of the formation of the revolutionary trade union organizations, purely revolutionary organizations.

As a result of the shift in trade-union policy steps were taken through Moscow to build up a left wing group in the trade unions, particularly in the American Federation of Labor, which were organized to bore within the American Federation of Labor, to capture the A. F. of L.

Foster, who fought that policy, was approached by the representative of Moscow trade unions sent to the United States and induced to take a trip to Russia. Browder was collaborating with Foster at that time, but was not a member of the Communist Party then. Foster maintained a small ineffectual organization known as the Trade Union Educational League, and he consented to Scott's proposal to make a trip to Moscow, and at that time he learned from Moscow Communists that they had changed their line of trade unions. They were opposed to dual unionism and they gave full support to the Trade Union Educational League.

The first conference they held was with the Trade Union Educational League, and its financial report shows that Moscow supplied Foster with a fund of \$25,000 to start the T. U. E. L., the Trade Union Educational League in the United States.

I will read from this report and you will see just how the financial status of his organization jumped upon his return from Moscow in 1921.

In October 1920 the receipts of Foster's organization were \$100 and the expenditures nothing.

In November 1920 the receipts were \$10 and the expenses \$9.90. In December it was \$114.30 receipts and expenditures \$2.80.

In January 1921, that is when Scott saw him and arranged this trip to Moscow, the receipts jumped to \$556 and the expenditures were \$61.

MR. WHITLEY. Those are traveling expenses?

MR. GITLOW. Yes. In February the receipts were \$132 and the expenditures \$80. In March he was on his way across, and the receipts were \$10, and the expenditures for ocean travel, and so forth were \$725.95.

Then he was in Moscow in April, May, June, July, August, and September, and the financial statement shows nothing paid. That is all printed in the official organ of the Trade Union Educational League.

Returned in October. The receipts jumped; receipts, \$840, expenditures, \$192.75.

November, \$183 receipts; \$633 expenses.

December, \$738 receipts; \$2,600 expenses.

January 1922, \$1,700 receipts; expenses, \$1,171.

Then it goes on with about \$1,500 average receipts and about, almost the same—a little less—expenditures, leaving a cash on hand of \$1,022.96; total expenditures, \$13,000.

In other words, an organization that averaged less than \$100 income before Moscow supplied it with funds suddenly jumped to over \$1,000 a month income. And there was no income from any rank and file in those days, because I was connected with the Trade Union Educational League; it was in the process of education, and no moneys at all were received from the rank and file. That indicates merely that all the money was supplied by Moscow to start this left-wing organization which at first claimed that it had nothing to do with the Communists whatsoever.

Now, I want—

MR. WHITLEY. Excuse me for interrupting, Mr. Gitlow, but in order to clarify and identify the T. U. E. L., the Trade Union Educational League, that, as I understand, was the forerunner of the T. U. U. L., which was the R. I. L. U. independent labor union?

MR. GITLOW. The T. U. E. L. was connected with the R. I. L. U. It was part of it, too.

MR. WHITLEY. It was part of the T. U. U. L., too, was it not?

MR. GITLOW. It changed its name from one to the other.

MR. WHITLEY. The T. U. U. L. unions are the unions that Mr. Browder during his testimony stated had no connection with the Communist Party, although the Communists were sympathetic to them while they were operating in this country.

MR. GITLOW. The T. U. U. L. were completely Communist unions, and in 1928 and following—particularly 1929 and 1930—the T. U. U. L. unions all split away, the groups, and formed unions of their own, and called themselves revolutionary unions. There was a National Textile Workers Union; a National Miners' Union; a Needle-Trades Workers Industrial Union. They all split away from the American Federation of Labor, these left groups, and tried to capture the masses of the American trade-unionists, for unions which were dominated 100 percent by the Communist Party.

*Financial report from October 1920 to August 26, 1922*

	Receipts	Expend- itures		Receipts	Expend- itures
October 1920.....	\$100.00	9.90	December.....	\$738.08	\$26.55
November.....	10.00	9.90	January 1922.....	1,700.45	1,171.23
December.....	114.30	2.80	February.....	588.51	1,560.59
January 1921.....	556.00	61.35	March.....	1,473.40	1,182.69
February.....	132.00	80.80	April.....	1,696.41	1,643.37
March.....	10.00	725.95	May.....	1,296.26	1,594.17
April, May, June, July, Au- gust, and September, noth- ing doing.			June.....	1,288.72	1,234.99
October.....	840.32	192.75	July.....	1,516.97	1,066.25
November.....	183.40	633.35	August.....	1,208.55	1,240.63
			Total.....	13,453.37	12,430.41

Cash on hand Aug. 26, \$1,022.96.

## REPORT OF FINANCE COMMITTEE

The finance committee has gone over the receipts and expenditures of the Trade Union Educational League, from October 1920, to August 26, 1922, and find a balance on hand of \$1,022.96, less a small item of bank exchange for August 1922.

Owing to the fact that the league ledger is now in the hands of the police, your committee is unable to make a complete and thorough auditing of the books, and recommends that a local league auditing committee of three be selected to make a complete and thorough audit as soon as the ledger can be procured from the police, or a new ledger constructed, which latter will probably take a month's work.

H. E. KEAS,  
CHAS. BLOME,  
S. T. HAMMERSMARK,  
*Financial Committee.*

Mr. WHITLEY. You will develop that further when you get into the trade-union subject?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You are going to continue on this subject of contributions and funds and finances?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is right.

Mr. GITLOW. Now, on the question of funds which the party received from Moscow, when I took the first trip to Moscow in 1927, on the way over, we got a report that the Arcos was raided by the British Government, and certain documents were obtained. We read the names that were given out and were surprised to find that the British Government had obtained all our connections for the receipt of confidential material and money from Moscow.

In Moscow we further talked over this question with the organization department of the Communist International and with Piatnitsky. On our way back we were instructed to stop over at the Russian Embassy to see one of the G.-P.-U. men there—a short fellow, I cannot remember his name—who had an office in the Unter-den-Linden, in the Russian Embassy.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the Russian Embassy in Berlin?

Mr. GITLOW. That is the Russian Embassy in Berlin; to take up with him the question of forwarding new confidential addresses since the ones disclosed by the British Government were no good any more, and to make other arrangements for the forwarding of confidential matter from abroad to our party. On our return to the United States, the first one we saw on this matter was Joseph Brodsky, who handled these confidential matters for us, and we asked him whether he had destroyed all the material he had in his office on the forwarding of documents to and from, addresses, and so forth, and he informed us that he had, and we made other arrangements with him at that particular time.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, yesterday Mr. Brodsky testified under oath before this committee that he had never been, and is not now, and had never been, a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. GITLOW. Well, Mr. Brodsky was a member of the Communist Party holding a position of the highest confidence. He was not only the party's main legal adviser, but he was a party member who handled confidential matters and money matters for us continuously. In fact, his advice was sought even on party policy. But he represents a group of party members whose membership is known only to the

Central Executive Committee of the party, and perhaps only to the political committee, and in some instances only to the secretariat.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the party makes every possible effort to protect Mr. Brodsky from any outward identification with the party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. In other words, Brodsky does not attend a unit meeting where members of the party attend. In other words, the rank and file would never know Brodsky as a party member. But we had meetings of our political committee in Brodsky's office on Broadway and Union Square. I forget the number; it was Seventeenth Street, corner of Broadway. That was the building. We had many meetings of our political committee in his office, and Brodsky was very often present at the most important and confidential meetings of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, just a few of the highest officials, a few of the inner circle that he met with or had any contact with as a Communist.

Mr. GITLOW. Well, he was known as a lawyer throughout the party, but on important party matters he was only with the highest and leading committees of the party.

The CHAIRMAN. Did I understand you to say that there were a group of members who were not known generally to the rank and file?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. What type of people were they?

Mr. GITLOW. Generally, the type of people who would be useful in fields if they were not known as Communists. For example, if we had a research worker who had a reputation for impartial research and was connected with an outstanding research bureau, we would not pronounce to the world that he was a party member, because we could use him as an impartial research worker who could present communistic facts and figures as impartial facts and figures.

Mr. THOMAS. What was Mr. Brodsky's party name?

Mr. GITLOW. He did not have a party name. He was known as Joseph Brodsky and was not known as a party member to the rank and file, but cooperated and worked with the officials of the party as an important party figure.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you recall, Mr. Gitlow, whether the address of Mr. Brodsky's office, at which you said some of the meetings of the committee were held, was 799 Broadway?

Mr. GITLOW. I could not be positive at this time.

Mr. WHITLEY. But it was on Broadway?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you think about Seventeenth Street. There were two addresses—

Mr. GITLOW. I do not think 799 was Brodsky's office, because 799 was the party address at the time.

Mr. WHITLEY. There were two addresses at the time of the raid on Arcos, the Russian trade organization in London. The list of addresses taken from the possession of Anton Miller, who was the cipher man at those headquarters, had two addresses for Brodsky, one, the notation on his list said, for money, per bank, Joseph R. Brodsky, 799 Broadway, New York, and the other address, on the same list, Joseph R. Brodsky, room 703, 41 Union Square, New York.

Mr. GITLOW. That would be the right address. That was Brodsky's address.

Mr. WHITLEY. Then there is another notation on the same list, obtained from Anton Miller, under the heading "Address for the sending of funds," one, Joseph Brodsky, room 703, 41 Union Square, New York; and then, written in German under that, for the party and other organizations.

Now, while testifying under oath yesterday before the committee, these notations were read to Mr. Brodsky. They are contained in an official document of the English Government. He stated that he had never been able to understand why his name appeared on such a list, that he had endeavored to ascertain why his name would be on the list, and he stated emphatically that he had never at any time had anything to do with the transmission of funds for the Communist Party.

Can you furnish any information along that line to the committee, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. GITLOW. The only thing I know is that his address was used and that he was used on confidential matters, and he had the whole record of all our connections for the transmission of all this confidential matter; and I and Lovestone were in his office when we returned and spoke with him about that matter, and the Arcos raids—

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know of your own personal knowledge whether he ever actually received funds through such a source?

Mr. GITLOW. That I could not tell you.

Mr. STARNES. But he was designated for that purpose?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; he was designated for that purpose, according to the report of the British Government. All that I know is that he had charge of all our confidential connections for this purpose and kept the list in his own safe, in his office, and upon our return to the United States he informed us that he had destroyed it.

The CHAIRMAN. How about these funds? Are we going to develop that a little further before we leave this subject? There are certain things that I think ought to be clarified. First, if he is in a position to say, approximately how much was sent here from Moscow and for what purposes was it to be used? Was it used solely for the Communist Party or other activities in front organizations, or political purposes, or what? Where did this money go: how was it used?

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you cover that?

Mr. GITLOW. I will cover that now. These funds were donated directly to the party; to the party press; to some of the front organizations; to our trade-union campaigns, and assistance for relief purposes, and so forth. They varied. If a certain campaign would be of particular importance, we would get assistance in running that campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of a campaign?

Mr. GITLOW. Let me give you this, for example. One time the Communist Party was very much interested in launching a national labor party in this country. That was from 1923 on. We held a national convention in Chicago and then one in St. Paul, Minn. We had conferences all over the country. We made contact with Farmer-Laborites all over the United States and paid their expenses to these conferences and to these conventions. This money was supplied, a large portion of it, to us by the Comintern.

At another time we were very much interested in capturing the

United Mine Workers of America and destroying the leadership over the United Mine Workers of America, of John L. Lewis. At that time John L. Lewis was an outspoken antagonist of Soviet Russia. His journal carried articles about the deplorable conditions of miners in Soviet Russia and showed how their standard of living was far below the standard of living of American miners. He was the spear-head of a campaign in the trade-unions against Soviet Russia.

MR. STARNES. That was when he was a member of the American Federation of Labor?

MR. GITLOW. Yes; that was when he was a member of the American Federation of Labor. The Communist Party at that time and Russia in particular was interested that this important and powerful trade-union should take a position in favor of Russia and not against Russia. They said that it was all very nice and good for the Communist Party to have an influential following in needle-trades unions, but we must get a following in a basic industry like the coal-mining industry, and among the coal miners. So we started a campaign against John L. Lewis. We were supported very handsomely by Moscow in this campaign. I know personally of two installments of funds for this campaign in which we got at one time \$50,000 and at another time \$50,000, making a total of \$100,000.

THE CHAIRMAN. Was that the time Mr. Lewis charged, as I think he did about 1924, that Moscow had sent money to the United States to oppose him?

MR. GITLOW. Yes: around that time.

THE CHAIRMAN. He also charged that some of the money was sent to John Brophy. Were you familiar with that?

MR. GITLOW. Yes; I was familiar with that. I would like to deal with that on the trade-union question more in detail and just deal with the financial question at this time.

MR. WHITLEY. Did all of the funds that were sent over by the Comintern—were they all earmarked or designated for a particular purpose?

MR. GITLOW. Generally they were earmarked.

MR. WHITLEY. In other words, they did not send over a lump sum to be used as the party sought fit in this country?

MR. GITLOW. No. As a rule they were earmarked, but sometimes funds designated for one purpose were parts of it, used for something else. The party had control over it, and it could do it. But as a rule these funds were all earmarked.

MR. WHITLEY. For a specific purpose?

MR. GITLOW. Yes: now, some of the donations of the Comintern and the Profintern to the American Party—when we started the Daily Worker, in Chicago, we received an initial fund of \$35,000 from Moscow to start the Daily Worker. Before that time we had a Weekly Worker.

MR. WHITLEY. Was Moscow particularly interested that the party in this country set up a daily paper?

MR. GITLOW. Moscow was particularly interested in the party of this country setting up a daily paper. While it did not supply all the funds required for publishing the paper, it nevertheless gave an initial donation at the time of \$35,000.

MR. WHITLEY. What year was that?

MR. GITLOW. I think the paper was started in 1924, I believe.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall, Mr. Gitlow, that Zinoviev sent a cablegram to the party instructing the party to launch the Daily Worker, and that cablegram was carried on the first page of the Daily Worker itself?

Mr. GITLOW. I recall that.

Mr. WHITLEY. And who was Zinoviev?

Mr. GITLOW. Chairman of the Communist International at the time.

Mr. WHITLEY. And he sent a cablegram instructing the launching of the Daily Worker in this country?

Mr. GITLOW. And welcoming it, and so forth.

Mr. WHITLEY. Subsequently it was supported financially to the extent of \$35,000?

Mr. GITLOW. Before it appeared we got an initial donation of \$35,000, and there was a drive for \$100,000 to make its publication possible as a daily.

Now, we have another interesting phase of Communist activity which involved the expenditure of a lot of money, which is represented by Moscow's subsidies, and that is the publishing field. We have in the United States a publishing company known as International Publishers. International Publishers has published the works of Lenin and of all the Bolshevik leaders. It publishes now the books of Stalin and all the works that the Communist International is interested in distributing in the United States.

This company was formed first as a stock company, in which 51 percent of the stock was owned by party members in this country; one who is not an open party member, but a secret party member, who happens to have money of his own, a fellow by the name of A. H. Heller, and Trachtenberg. Heller owned 51 percent of the stock, and the Communist International owned 49 percent of the stock. When I was in Moscow in 1928 the literature department of the Communist International took up with me the question of the International Publishers and told me of the arrangements they had with Heller, and asked my opinion of it. I told them that in the United States if somebody has a majority of 1 percent of the stock he owns the corporation and can do with it whatever he sees fit. Therefore, I advised them to get at least 51 percent of the stock for the Communist International. They supplied all the manuscripts, they supplied many of the printed pages for the books that are sent here in order to avoid paying excessive duties, and other subsidies which are in the value of thousands and thousands of dollars are supplied to the International Publishers. They do not have to pay authors' royalties, and so forth, on the books which they publish and sell in the United States, and which are supplied to them by the Communist International. So that change was made, so that today the Communist International owns the International Publishers, which operates in the United States as an out-and-out capitalist concern.

Mr. WHITLEY. Operates as a privately owned corporation.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; a publishing house.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the two original incorporators, organizers of the corporation, were Mr. Heller and Mr. Alexander Trachtenberg?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether they are still connected with the International Publishers?

Mr. GITLOW. I do not know if Heller is, but Trachtenberg still is.

Mr. WHITLEY. You say they are both party members?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the company was set up by the Communists as its own publishing house?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. But under the guise of a private publishing concern.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you get the address of that concern?

Mr. GITLOW. I think it is 381 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you pursue the question of contributions further?

Mr. GITLOW. In the 1924 election campaign, the Communist International donated \$50,000 to help the party run this campaign.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you helped as a member of the secretariat, the ruling body of the party helped to handle those funds and budgeted them for the campaign.

Mr. GITLOW. For the campaign; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of course, you were also a candidate, a vice-presidential candidate during that campaign?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; now, I told you before about a fund of \$50,000 which was given to the party to run the miners' campaign in 1927 and 1928. This fund of \$50,000 was in the hands of William Z. Foster, who was in charge of the miners' campaign for the party.

The initial funds received for the miners' campaign Foster handled himself, and the secretariat never checked up on his expenditures, but on the last installment we made a motion in the secretariat that all of these funds must be spent upon the decision of the secretariat and an accounting must be given to the secretariat for the expenditure of these funds.

In 1928 Foster and Lovestone, who were members of the secretariat, went as delegates to the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International. So the secretariat made a decision that the funds should be turned over to me, and I should expend them for the miners' campaign.

I received from Morris Nemser, who was the custodian of the records, the archives of the Communist Party, and also received the bulk of this money—I received from him at various times a total in cash, of money received from Moscow, of \$23,450. This money was turned over to me on the following dates: June 18, \$500; June 20, \$1,000; June 24, \$2,000; making a total of \$3,500; July 10, \$3,500; July 16, \$800; July 21, \$2,000; July 30, \$2,000; August 1, \$1,500; August 7, \$1,000; August 8, \$1,000; August 14, \$1,000; August 22, \$20,000; August 30, \$1,500; and from Lovestone—which he turned over to Lovestone—\$1,000, leaving a balance in his hands of \$2,150.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those figures that you read out—were they the dates?

Mr. GITLOW. Those were the dates.

Mr. WHITLEY. What year?

Mr. GITLOW. 1928.

Mr. WHITLEY. 1928?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the first date?

Mr. GITLOW. June 18; from the sixth month to the eighth month—approximately 2½ months.

Mr. WHITLEY. And those were the funds which you were to expend in connection with this campaign to win over the miners?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. All of which came from Moscow?

The CHAIRMAN. Did you use those funds for the purpose for which they were intended?

Mr. GITLOW. I will explain this. It will make a very interesting story to see how we manipulated—

The CHAIRMAN. Later on?

Mr. GITLOW. Right now, because it flows right from this. These funds were turned over to me in cash and I had to deposit these funds in the party treasury. All the funds had to be received in the party treasury. But you could not receipt them as funds coming from Moscow, so fictitious names were put on the receipts. For example, I have here a receipt of July 9, 1928, received from Jacob Rand, donation, \$1,000. There is no Jacob Rand. You can look from today to tomorrow and you will not find a Jacob Rand.

Then I have, July 30, received from Samuel Phillips, \$1,000 donation.

July 20, received from James Franklin, donation, \$400.

July 21, Robert Brown, \$500. All of these are fictitious names. I have all the receipts here. I could read many of them to cover this amount.

Someone may ask me why I kept these receipts at the time. Well, when you belong to a political organization like the Communist Party, you begin to realize that you have got to be very careful on money matters, because if you come into opposition with the policies of the party, they may try to involve you in some money scandal in order to discredit you. So I have kept all these receipts and all the accountings in my possession, if any such eventuality arose.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those are all your original records made at the time?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; those are my original records made at the time.

Now, I have here a receipt in Russian; this is in the Russian handwriting. I also turned over \$1,000 to a man named Marcus. Marcus was sent here as a representative of the Profintern to the American Party and of the Comintern. I turned over to him \$1,000 to defray his expenses in this country, and I got a receipt for that \$1,000.

At that time Juliet Stuart Poyntz had to leave for Moscow to be the women's representative of the party in Moscow, and she needed funds to go over. I took out of these funds \$100 which I turned over to her, and I have a receipt of \$100 in her handwriting, of the money turned over out of these funds to defray those expenses. "Received of Comrade Gitlow for expenses of European trip, Juliet Stuart Poyntz."

Mr. WHITLEY. Was Juliet Stuart Poyntz an active member of the party, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. GITLOW. Juliet Stuart Poyntz was a very active member of the party, a candidate for the party in election campaigns, and was head of the party's women's work, and was sent to Moscow by the party

in 1928 to represent the party in the women's department of the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. She was not only active, but prominent?

Mr. GITLOW. Active and prominent, and had a good following among the members of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the leaders and those closely associated with them?

Mr. GITLOW. Surely. She was a member of the New York committee, the largest committee of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know what happened to Juliet Stuart Poyntz?

Mr. GITLOW. All I knew was what appeared in the newspapers—that she mysteriously disappeared from her apartment and never returned.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was, of course, after you had ceased your activity?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, do you know whether Marcus was also known under the name of Jenks?

Mr. GITLOW. He was also known as Jenks, and wrote a pamphlet on the organization work of the party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that a matter of common knowledge among the leaders of the party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was testified to here yesterday that Jenks was not known to the witness, Mr. Browder, by any other name.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Gitlow, referring to these receipts that you have introduced, in entering up the receipts, instead of saying that the money came from the Comintern, you entered them simply as voluntary contributions?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; as voluntary contributions or loans.

Another point you must keep in mind. This money was deposited by the national office of the party in the bank. Then we had to turn this money over to the miners' committee at that time for organizing the National Miners' Convention. The party did not mail a check to this committee, because that would disclose the relationship between the party and the so-called union organization. What was done, the money was drawn in cash and generally cabled or telegraphed to the miners' organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. That miners' committee was supposed to be an entirely independent group, with no affiliations?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just one other question, Mr. Gitlow, before we continue. Do you know whether Marcus, alias Jenks, was known to Mr. Browder while he was in this country?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course he was.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, Mr. Browder knew who Marcus was?

Mr. GITLOW. Not only knew Marcus in this country, but he knew Marcus in Moscow, when he was a representative of the party at the Profintern at Moscow.

Mr. WHITLEY. And he also knew that Marcus used the name "Jenks"?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course.

Mr. WHITLEY. And if he testified otherwise under oath, he was misrepresenting?

Mr. GITLOW. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Before we leave this, you say the money that came from Moscow was in turn transmitted to the miners' committee?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. To be spent to finance the strike in the coal mines?

Mr. GITLOW. Not at that time. This time we wanted to call together a miners' convention and organize a new miners' union.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. GITLOW. And it was for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. That money also was to be used to oppose John L. Lewis at that time?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; surely.

The CHAIRMAN. And was it used for that purpose?

Mr. GITLOW. The bulk of the money was used for that purpose; yes:

The CHAIRMAN. Was it given to men within the organization? I mean how was it used for that purpose?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I have here—I will show you how it was used.

The CHAIRMAN. While we have that fund in mind, unless you have something else to develop, Mr. Whitley, it might be well for him to give us that information.

Mr. GITLOW. Here it is.

August 15, 1928. Received from B. Gitlow, \$500 for miners' campaign. Signed, A. Jakira.

Jakira was the district organizer of district 5, which took in the Pittsburgh area of the soft-coal mining region.

The CHAIRMAN. District organizer of the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; of the Communist Party. He was never a miner. He was one of the officials, the district official of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. He had no connection with the United Mine Workers?

Mr. GITLOW. No, no; never. He could not lift up a pick if he wanted to.

Then I have here—I will read you how the expenses were met:

Swabeck received on June 22—I gave him \$180 in cash. Swabeck was the Central Executive Committee representative of the Communist Party in this miners' campaign. In other words, he saw to it that decisions made by the Communist Party for the miners' campaign were carried out by the miners, and he was a special party organizer in that campaign, and he received out of this money, for his expenses, \$180.

Swabeck, on July 11—that was to pay other organizers—\$136.

Gardos, another organizer who was in the field, \$13.50.

Meyerscough, who was a legitimate miner in the Communist Party, and a leader of our Communist forces, \$39.49.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he also a member of the United Mine Workers?

Mr. GITLOW. He was an expelled member of the United Mine Workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he expelled on account of his activities?

Mr. GITLOW. He was expelled on account of his opposition to John L. Lewis.

Then, on July 14, to the national convention committee—that is, the national miners' convention committee, with headquarters at 119 Federal Street, room 411—on July 14 I transmitted to them \$500.

For example, Stachel, who is today the secretary of the national committee of the Communist Party, and in my opinion the real power in the American Communist Party, outside of the Russians—Browder being only the figurehead—Stachel received \$40 for certain miners' expenses.

Then we have an item here of July 20: Ravitch, who was business manager of the Daily Worker, received \$72.60.

And I could go on all along here and read you party people who got different sums out of this money for their activities in connection with the miners, who were not miners.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is your original book of accounts, showing how the funds which were in your hands were expended?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. For the sake of the record, none of that money went to any official or member of the United Mine Workers?

Mr. GITLOW. No, no.

The CHAIRMAN. It went to party members?

Mr. GITLOW. Party members.

The CHAIRMAN. To be used for the purpose of opposing John L. Lewis?

Mr. GITLOW. And smashing the miners' union.

The CHAIRMAN. In reference to the charge that Lewis made that Brophy received money, do you know anything about that?

Mr. GITLOW. That was in reference to the first campaign, where we had to save the union campaign, and we had an election slate opposing John L. Lewis, and heading that slate was John Brophy, and Powers Hapgood was involved in that activity. At that time John Brophy collaborated with the Communist Party. All the expenses involved in his campaign to be elected president of the United Mine Workers of America were paid—Brophy's expenses were paid by the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the reason that Lewis charged that Brophy had received money from Moscow?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that what led up to the charge and the expulsion of Brophy?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. And that charge was true?

Mr. GITLOW. Absolutely true.

Mr. STARNES. Was Brophy a Communist?

Mr. GITLOW. Brophy was not a member of the Communist Party, but he was a member of the opposition element in the United Mine Workers who were trying to oust Lewis, and was willing to accept whatever financial assistance the party gave him.

The CHAIRMAN. Later the attitude of the Communists toward the United Mine Workers and the C. I. O. changed, did it not?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. That came much later.

The CHAIRMAN. That is only of recent origin?

Mr. GITLOW. That is of recent origin; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And there ceased to be opposition between the Communists and the C. I. O. officials; is that true?

Mr. GITLOW. Lewis is the greatest trade-union figure in the eyes of the Communist Party today.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not contending that he is a member?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I don't think so.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you repeat that last answer, if you please? I did not get it.

Mr. GITLOW. I say Lewis, today, in the eyes of the Communist Party, is the outstanding trade-union leader in America.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that does not necessarily mean that Lewis approves of it?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I do not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not say that Lewis is sympathetic with everything that the Communist Party stands for?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. But the result is that at this time the Communists, instead of opposing John L. Lewis' leadership, are now supporting it?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS. Would it not be more accurate to say, instead of supporting certain organizations, they are now attacking all of them?

Mr. GITLOW. Their attitude has changed. For example, in 1919 they opposed the A. F. of L. In 1921 and 1922 they decided on the policy of working inside the A. F. of L. to revolutionize the organization, but not to break it up. In other words, they were working against the officialdom of the A. F. of L. as reactionaries, and wanted them to adopt a left-wing revolutionary policy for the A. F. of L. Then, later on, in the latter part of 1927, 1928, 1929, and 1930, they abandoned their policy of boring within the trade-unions and organized unions of their own, which they called revolutionary unions, affiliated through the Red International of Trade Unions, for the purpose of coming directly to grips with the A. F. of L. for the winning of the trade-union masses in America; and this change in policy was dictated, not by American considerations but by Russian considerations, which we will go into at a later period.

Then they changed again. They changed from that position and went back to the original position of working again inside of the American Federation of Labor, and when the C. I. O. was formed they threw all their resources behind the C. I. O. drive, but in those A. F. of L. unions where they maintain some control and cannot bring the unions into the C. I. O. they still maintain them as A. F. of L. unions and still work for the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L.

Mr. VOORHIS. But the real basic attitude of the members of the Communist Party toward the American labor movement has never changed, has it? I mean, the objectives that they were trying to reach and the things that they really thought about the American labor movement, have been substantially the same, in spite of the fact that these attacks have been made?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, the basic reason for their working in the trade-unions still remains the same. They believe that through the trade unions they have an opportunity of building up a mass base, as they call it, for the Communist movement. In other words, they can get millions of supporters for the Communist Party if they can gain sufficient control of the trade-union masses.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Have we finished the evidence about these contributions?

**Mr. WHITLEY.** No; I think Mr. Gitlow has some more data with reference to funds received from Moscow and the purpose for which they were used.

**The CHAIRMAN.** All right.

**Mr. WHITLEY.** To summarize the testimony that you have just given, Mr. Gitlow, here we have a typical example of Moscow money being furnished through the Communist Party of the United States to smash a trade union in the United States so that the Communists can get control of it. Is that not the picture? Is not that what they were trying to do there?

**Mr. GITLOW.** At one time they were trying to get control of it by working inside of the union, and at another time they were trying to gain control of the miners as such by building a union of their own which would attract all the miners to their own particular union.

**Mr. WHITLEY.** When the working inside failed, then they went out to build a competitive union, a union of their own, and in order to do that, of course, they would naturally want to disrupt the existing union in every way possible?

**Mr. GITLOW.** The reason for it was not that; not because the one policy failed and another one would be successful. The reason for it was that certain political considerations in Russia demanded that they change this policy. You must keep in mind that the Communist Party is more interested in Russian affairs, and when it plays politics in the United States it plays politics in the United States with an eye to their effect upon Moscow interests, and if a policy in the United States should be excellent for the mass of the American people and, in their opinion, detrimental to the interests of Soviet Russia, they would oppose that policy, because the interests of Soviet Russia would come first and American interests second.

**Mr. VOORHIS.** In other words, you mean that the Communist Party in America would sacrifice the basic economic or other interests of the rank and file of the American people if they felt that by so doing they could benefit the Soviet Union?

**Mr. GITLOW.** Of course.

**Mr. STARNES.** That would account in some degree for the defense which the witness Browder made on yesterday of the nonaggression pact between Soviet Russia and Germany?

**Mr. GITLOW.** Of course. For example, today he says that the non-aggression pact between Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany broke the axis, but we know, according to newspaper reports, that conferences are going on between the Soviet Union and Japan, and if they should conclude a nonaggression pact with Japan, then Japan no longer becomes an axis power. But this is a pact for peace, and you can bet your boots that Browder would not insist that the United States Government declare an embargo on Japanese products in such an event.

**Mr. WHITLEY.** Although he is insisting that that be done now?

**Mr. GITLOW.** Yes.

**Mr. STARNES.** Mr. Gitlow, you mentioned Powers Hapgood a moment ago. Do you know whether or not he was ever a Communist?

**Mr. GITLOW.** Well, we have a varied record of Powers Hapgood. At one time he was considered a member of our party, and at another

time we were opposed to his activities. He broke with the party. What his position is today I do not know.

Mr. STARNES. This morning you mentioned the employees of the Amtorg, and you said that the employees in this country were passed upon by the party before they were placed on the pay rolls of the company.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know a man by the name of Philip Davis, who has been employed by the Amtorg?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I do not know him. The personnel of the Amtorg has been changed since my time, and I would not be in a position to know many of them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have one question arising immediately out of the statement that Mr. Gitlow just made with respect to the interests of the American Communists in the internal affairs of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Do you recall that Stalin himself at one time arrived at a point of what might be called disgust at the manner in which all the American Communists were concerned about the affairs of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, for the information of the committee, the Communist Party of the United States got out a pamphlet—I think I may have a copy of it here. Here it is: Stalin's Speeches on the American Communist Party. That was published by the party itself.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. In the United States; yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does this pamphlet contain a statement by Stalin himself upbraiding the entire American party for its excessive interest in the party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir; I recall something to that effect.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, there is such a page in this pamphlet. I ask your permission, if it is agreeable, to incorporate that in the record at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

(The matter referred to follows:

#### STALIN'S SPEECHES ON THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST PARTY

Pages 12-13.

"You know that both groups of the American Communist Party, competing with each other and chasing after each other like horses in a race, are feverishly speculating on existing and non-existing differences within the C. P. S. U. Why do they do that? Do the interests of the Communist Party of America demand it? No; of course not. They do it in order to gain some advantage for their own particular faction and to cause injury to the other faction. Foster and Bittleman see nothing reprehensible in declaring themselves "Stalinites" and thereby demonstrating their loyalty to the C. P. S. U. But, my dear comrades, that is disgraceful. Do you not know that there are no "Stalinites," that there must be no "Stalinites"? Why does the minority act in this unseemly fashion? In order to entrap the majority group, the group of Comrade Lovestone, and to prove that the Lovestone group is opposed to the C. P. S. U. and, hence, to the basic nucleus in the Comintern." (C. P. S. U.=Communist Party of the Soviet Union.)

Mr. GITLOW. In other words, I hope to have the opportunity of reporting to the committee my personal experiences with Stalin, which cover a period of 3 years.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Matthews, it is not clear to me why you bring that point up.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow said, in answer to a question, that American Communists were primarily interested in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, or more interested than they were in the American party in the strict sense of the word. Stalin himself charged the American party with just that matter. In fact, it had grown to such extremes that you will find that the language of Stalin is very sarcastic on that point.

Mr. GITLOW. But this must be kept in mind, and I will discuss that under the question of Stalin—that Stalin himself is guilty of this attitude, because Stalin has always interfered in the affairs of the American party when the affairs of the American party seemed to jeopardize his interests in Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let us finish the contributions.

Mr. GITLOW. I think I have finished the contributions, unless you would like to have—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). The contributions are confusing to me. I wonder if you cannot in some way give us a list of the ones you know about in some chronological order, for the sake of the record, so that we will know just what the information is.

Mr. WHITLEY. He has named the different channels which, of his own knowledge as a ranking official of the party, he knows that the funds came through, and the manner in which they came through, and the sources they came from, and how they were used.

Mr. STARNES. Let him put in a tabulation or a summary of that information.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, is not this necessarily confused? Is not that the very way it was done, to make it confusing?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that is it. But suppose you recapitulate, to see if we understand, the various methods through which it came.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe Mr. Gitlow, in testifying concerning the sources of income of the Communist Party of the United States, has named first dues and contributions from members and sympathizers. Then he mentioned the manner in which funds are obtained from trade unions which are Communist-controlled—in other words, which amounts to just a raid on the treasury by Communist orders. He has described and given illustrations of the manner in which the party obtains funds from the front organizations which it controls, and he gave as an example of that the Friends of Soviet Russia, and the funds which he said were over a million dollars, taken up in contributions for the relief of the Russian sufferers during the early twenties, a large portion of which funds came back into the treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but I am speaking of funds from Moscow.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; I thought I gave the whole thing—all the sources. He has mentioned the manner in which the party indirectly receives subsidies through Amtorg, World Tourists, and Intourist, all of which are Soviet organizations in this country, supposedly legitimate business organizations; and he has mentioned the manner in which funds have come in from Russia, from Moscow, direct.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be the approximate total of the funds that he knows about?

Mr. WHITLEY. What would be your approximation, if you can make one, Mr. Gitlow, of the total amount of money received from Moscow?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, that would vary. For example, in one year we received \$35,000 directly from Moscow for the Daily Worker.

The CHAIRMAN. What year was that?

Mr. GITLOW. That was in 1924. We received approximately \$50,000 for trade-union work—

The CHAIRMAN. In the same year?

Mr. GITLOW. That same year. I would say offhand that it fluctuated between \$100,000 and \$150,000 for various activities and enterprises a year.

The CHAIRMAN. From what year to what year?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, the years I was connected with it; I would say from 1922 on until 1929.

Mr. WHITLEY. It fluctuated between approximately \$100,000 and \$150,000 a year received directly?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not include the indirect subsidies?

Mr. WHITLEY. That did not include the subsidies received from the Amtorg, the World Tourists, the Intourist, and those organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no way of estimating what those would amount to?

Mr. GITLOW. That would be very difficult to determine.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you estimate that the amount would be larger from the indirect sources than from the direct sources?

Mr. GITLOW. At one time we took that up in the secretariat of the party, what the combined expenses of the party were in all its activities, because the national office expense at the time I was there approximated \$100,000. Browder reports that the expenses of the national office today approximate about \$200,000, and that would be an increase of about 50 percent. But when we take the party organization as a whole, with all its ramifications, trade-union expenditures, press, propaganda, publicity, and so forth, we estimated at that time that our expenditure amounted for the year—we had a special meeting of the secretariat and we were discussing that—to one million and a quarter a year.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was for every type of activity?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Gitlow, I am wondering if you could tell the committee whether the revenues from the indirect sources which Mr. Whitley referred to, and which you listed, would be greater each year than the revenues from the direct sources which were enumerated?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, that would be very difficult for me to determine offhand. I could not do that.

Mr. THOMAS. Would you say they were about the same?

Mr. GITLOW. I just could not tell you without going into a research on that proposition.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Gitlow, who succeeded you in your position as secretary?

Mr. GITLOW. I was succeeded by Max Bedacht.

Mr. CASEY. How long did he occupy that position?

Mr. GITLOW. For a short period of time; I don't recall exactly; and then he was followed by Earl Browder.

Mr. CASEY. Where does Bedacht live?

Mr. GITLOW. I don't know. At one time, when I was in the party, he lived in Chicago; then the national office moved to New York, and he

was an organizer in Chicago, and later he moved to New York; but what his present address is I do not know.

Mr. CASEY. Do you know whether or not these Russian contributions have continued since 1929, when you ceased to be secretary?

Mr. GITLOW. I have no personal intimate knowledge, but what I have attempted to show here is that the party is organized on such a basis that unless it gets such contributions it cannot support its many activities.

Mr. CASEY. Do you state that the party has not become self-sustaining?

Mr. GITLOW. It is not by any means.

Mr. CASEY. But it is necessary for it to get sources of revenue from outside of America?

Mr. GITLOW. It is necessary for it to continue to get sources of revenue when you take into consideration its activities and its membership.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Casey, pardon me just a minute. There will be later witnesses who will take this same line of testimony beyond the years that Mr. Gitlow is covering.

Mr. CASEY. All right.

Mr. GITLOW. What I have attempted to show here is that from the time I became secretary until the time I left the party, the party always lived on subsidies from Moscow.

The CHAIRMAN. The most astounding thing to me, that you have testified to today, is that here are the members of the Communist Party in the United States who, according to what you have said and other testimony, are in effect citizens of another country; that is, they owe allegiance to a foreign country. Now, what would happen if we went to war with that country? It would be a rather strange situation if they carried out the real teachings of the party.

Mr. GITLOW. That question came up in 1927 at the enlarged plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, which I attended. At that time it was reported to the plenum that a war was imminent. They expected the war to break out much sooner than it did, and they believed at the time that the main opponent of Soviet Russia would be Great Britain, on account of the August raids and certain other incidents which happened. So there was the question of determining what the policy of the Communist parties in all other countries should be in the event of a war. At that plenum the slogan was adopted that the workers of the world have only one fatherland, and that fatherland is the Soviet Union, and it is their duty to defend their fatherland in all countries.

The CHAIRMAN. If that be true, as you and other witnesses say it is, then would we not have this situation? Here are Russia and Germany, now allies. Suppose Russia goes to war on the side of Germany, and we are drawn into the war. Russia becomes our enemy. Here you have approximately a hundred thousand people in the United States who owe allegiance to Russia, and who could form a very effective spy and sabotage system in this country; and if they carried out their duties as Communists, that is what they would do, would they not?

Mr. GITLOW. Precisely; and a policy was worked out for such incidents which I will tell you right now, since you have raised the question.

What is the policy it was to follow? In the event of a war against the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union is allied with Germany, let us say, with Nazi Germany, or supposed to have a military alliance, and there is to be a war with Great Britain and France, you have Communists in Germany, and the Communist in Germany, regardless of the fact that they are opposed to Hitler, would have to support the German Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us carry that illustration a little further.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us assume that we are at war.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That Russia and Germany are on one side, for instance, and the United States drawn into the war.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. We enter.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. We find this complication: We have 5,000 branches in the United States, according to Browder's testimony.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. With approximately 100,000 people.

Mr. GITLOW. Members.

The CHAIRMAN. That owe allegiance to a foreign government.

Mr. GITLOW. Precisely.

The CHAIRMAN. Would they not be in a very good position to carry out espionage or sabotage throughout the United States in behalf of Russia; and then if the Nazi group is with them, groups like the bund and the allied groups that we have been considering here for 3 or 4 weeks we would simply have a whole network of spies.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Throughout this country.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And if the Communists are consistent with what they have done with reference to their defense of nazi-ism, then they have got to work together in this organization, into a national organization in the United States, with Russians and Germans working to that end.

Mr. GITLOW. And this could all be financed by having them organize their—

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). What would keep Kuhn and Browder and all these other organizations from working and collaborating together so we would have thousands of these units in the United States that could be turned into espionage and sabotage activities?

Mr. GITLOW. I think so, and if Stalin and Molotov can work with Hitler and Goering, I see no reason why Browder could not work with Kuhn.

The CHAIRMAN. And the unique position of the Communist Party would be this: That in the event of war and an alliance between Germany and Russia, then the Communist Party, having men in key positions, having some of them in the trade-unions, some in this union and some officials, and some organizers, it would seem to me that with their ability they would be able to do great damage to the United States during times of war.

Mr. GITLOW. Precisely. It was Stalin himself who told us that he would rather get 1 official of a trade-union into the Communist Party than 10,000 rank-and-file members.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, when we inquire into this labor-union question, I think it ought to be made clear, and I think the committee has made it clear, that it is not, because there are Communists masquerading in the unions, the C. I. O., or the A. F. of L. that the unions themselves are favorable to communism or that any large percent of their members are Communists. The very reverse is true. And because the unions may have a number of Communists in them is by no means an implication that the labor leaders in the United States are sympathetic with communism.

Mr. STARNES. Of course, the committee is not implying that.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. STARNES. The committee is not implying anything one way or the other. The labor leaders can speak for themselves, and certainly it is not for us to defend their position. I think it is a question for them to speak for themselves on—

The CHAIRMAN. I merely mean, when we make these inquiries, they are not to carry that implication.

Mr. STARNES. We are simply here to learn the facts and not to try to defend any man.

Mr. VOORHIS. I think the point the chairman has in mind is that because we have had testimony concerning dictation by the Communist Party, and evidence that various organizations may be attempting to work upon the leaders in the labor movements, is not to be implied that the leaders themselves are Communists.

Mr. STARNES. The American Federation of Labor last year sent one of its officials before this committee who supplied a great deal of testimony on this movement and expressed the position of the unions; and I do not think the committee needs to take a stand on the question one way or the other as they have a lot of people in the unions who can speak for themselves.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question about that, but I just thought that the statement should be made, and I think it should be clear that what we are trying to get are facts with reference to these activities.

Mr. CASEY. Because the questions are asked does not indicate the C. I. O. or A. F. of L. are communistic.

Mr. STARNES. Certainly not. I do not see any reason why we should be squeamish about it; I am in favor of getting the facts and letting the chips fall where they may.

Mr. CASEY. May I ask one further question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I am very much interested in your statement that Russia is the fatherland of all Communists.

Does that mean that the Communists in America, according to your testimony, owe a higher allegiance to Russia than they do to this country?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course.

Mr. CASEY. And might that not explain the attitude of the Communist Party, as expressed by Mr. Browder and the Daily Worker, in now favoring Russia and not being outraged at the pact with Germany?

Mr. GITLOW. You will find they favor everything in Russia. You will never find an American Communist opposing anything Russia does, but at the same time they will criticize certain acts of the Government of the United States

Mr. CASEY. So that some of the things we hear from Mr. Browder, in his backing of Stalin as not being antagonistic to the pact with Hitler—

Mr. GITLOW (interposing). I think that you will find he has not criticized Russia, but at the same time feels free to criticize his own country. But that certainly applies to the attitude of the Soviet Union, because everything the Soviet Union does is angelic, good, and the thing that should be done.

Mr. VOORHIS. I just want to ask you as to the opposing lines of argument under which they attempt to defend and justify the pact between Germany and Russia. As one who is familiar with Communist circles, how do they arrive at that; how was that determined upon?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, that may be determined in two ways: Lack of information on the line to pursue, the line of policy to pursue from Russia. The party itself may adopt a certain line of policy and only that line of policy will be advocated by the party leaders.

Each party leader may be pursuing a certain line of policy and he may, under certain circumstances, express his opinion in the committee of which he is a member, but he cannot express his opposition to the party to which he belongs, unless he is willing to pay the penalty of being expelled from the party.

Mr. VOORHIS. In other words, this line of defense is something predetermined?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. At a meeting of the leaders, and is afterward put out by everybody?

Mr. GITLOW. And generally is predetermined in the meeting after the leaders get certain advice by cable from Moscow.

Mr. VOORHIS. One other question. Was this requirement that has been brought out, concerning disloyalty under certain circumstances, resulting from party discipline, one of the principal reasons for your withdrawal from the party?

Mr. GITLOW. That was not the principal reason. At the time, the principal reason for my withdrawal, of my break with the Communists, was my conviction that the fundamental policies of communism, based upon dictation, abolition of liberty and democracy, would not improve economic conditions but would result in the contrary.

Mr. VOORHIS. Just as has happened?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. Was the turn of events in Europe and evident intention of the Soviet Union to pursue an entirely Machiavellian policy in this matter one of the main things that caused you to appear before this committee?

Mr. GITLOW. That was one of the main things, the principal reason, for coming before the committee, although I had long expected Russia to come to some agreement with Hitler, with the Nazis in Germany. In fact, about a year ago I thought the logical move for Stalin would lead to an alliance with Nazi Germany, and his actions at that time indicated that while he was charging the opposition with being Gestapos, at the same time he was doing that in order to be free to deal with Hitler.

Mr. VOORHIS. It is evident that this agreement had not been a matter of sudden decision after the break-down of negotiations with France and Britain but must have been a matter of negotiations for a considerable period of time.

Mr. GITLOW. I am of the opinion that it was a matter of negotiation covering a considerable period of time; that the discussions were going on between Nazi Germany and Stalin for a long period of time before they were consummated; and at that time, the very start of the negotiations with Great Britain, Molotov was of the opinion that they were going to have to negotiate with Germany also. Evidently the plan for an agreement had also been decided upon some time previously.

Mr. VOORHIS. Now, I would like to ask you this question: You have given evidence here of very large sums of money having been supplied the United States from the Comintern; presumably, similar sums of money were supplied to other nations.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. What was the source of those funds; what was the principle source of those funds? Assessments made against members of trade-unions, for example, of the Soviet Union?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, the Comintern funds and the Profintern funds to a large extent represent special assessments made against the members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the members in Russia have to pay those assessments.

Mr. VOORHIS. That is what I was asking about.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. How much do the members of the trades-unions have to pay? Assume they are not Communists, how much would they have to pay, and about how many assessments are they required to pay?

Mr. GITLOW. It is a regular check-off system, taken from the pay envelope; so much is deducted for trade-union assessments for international purposes.

Mr. VOORHIS. As a matter of general truth, in attempting to impress the members that it is an economic movement to improve conditions of people throughout the world, it is just as you have indicated, based upon setting up a force, which would be the end, possibly, of the real progressive economic movement.

Mr. GITLOW. That has been the basis of my break with communism.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Browder testified very clearly that whereas they had an agreement, he used the word "agreement"; you refer to discipline, and it all amounts to about the same thing.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He admitted that the Comintern issues the orders. Decisions are made and they must agree with them; the Communist in every country has to go along or either get out of the Comintern, and, of course, he admitted that he had himself ultimately agreed, which is another way of admitting, so far as concerned, that he obeys the dictates of the Comintern.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And if that would be true in Russia and in Germany, should there be a military alliance and with Stalin and Hitler, it is logical to assume that in the event a situation arose and the United States was dragged into war that they would be favorable to Germany or to Russia; in the event we got into a war and they got orders for spies, espionage, or sabotage, would not the obligation be upon the members of the Communist Party in the United States to work with the Nazi groups, along with the other parties, to take orders from the Comintern?

Mr. GITLOW. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. Since the Comintern controls the Communist Party.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Communist Party is, in turn, controlled by Stalin.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. So that an agreement made between Hitler and Stalin with reference to the present war would impress those in the Comintern which, in turn, would be the policy of the Soviet Union.

Now, would it be any more difficult for the Communists in the United States to turn about face and begin to work with the Nazi group here, or be any more inconsistent than this turn about face in Russia in joining with the Nazi movement?

Mr. GITLOW. I think they could make the turn-about, but it would not be as convincing.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not involve any more radical change of principle or fundamental policy than what took place, of course.

Mr. GITLOW. You have the statement of Mussolini recently that the Soviet Government and the Italian Government have a lot of things in common; both are opposed to international finance capital, and Hitler can come out with Stalin—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). So it becomes a matter of great concern to this country to ascertain how far they are going to go in this country when they are bound in their allegiance to a foreign government.

Mr. GITLOW. Particularly when they masquerade behind liberal slogans to defend democracy.

Mr. STARNES. I think that is the real thing, tying up and masquerading under liberal slogans.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you conclude your testimony I think you would render great service if you would distinguish between liberalism and communism.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Because it is a fact, is it not, that many people, for instance, well-intentioned people, have been deceived by the Communist slogans and have been drawn into the Communist movement under the guise that they are a move toward liberty.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I am very much interested in your statement that you felt that Russia was going into the pact with Germany.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Did you make any public utterance of that feeling?

Mr. GITLOW. Well I can tell you this: I wrote a book of my experience in the Communist, and wrote that a year ago: it is to be published soon, in a few weeks, in which I pointed out the similarities between the Nazi government and the Soviet government and predicted the pact long before the pact was entered into.

Mr. CASEY. You expected that there would be?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. And that will be published soon.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, you have given us a number of instances of individual subsidies for specific purposes that were sent over by the Comintern.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you in mind any other subsidies; in other words, any activities of parties that regularly, every year, receive a certain amount in the form of subsidies?

Mr. GITLOW. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. I had in mind the sort of publications as the Daily Worker, for instance.

Mr. GITLOW. No: each one is decided upon and the amount of the subsidy.

Mr. WHITLEY. In addition to the original subsidy of \$35,000 which was sent over to help establish and start the publication of the Daily Worker. Do you know of any other publications, or whether the Daily Worker subsequently receives subsidy from the Comintern?

Mr. GITLOW. Every year approximately around that sum.

Mr. WHITLEY. It has received each year approximately that sum?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is continuous?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. To keep it in operation?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. For example, the British Communist Press is supported entirely by the Communist International for the reason that the British Communist Party is a very weak organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. GITLOW. And therefore, to have a daily newspaper the expense of the newspaper is paid out of the Communist funds.

The CHAIRMAN. Could Russia spend money more effectively than to maintain a group within the United States of, say, a hundred thousand people who are working 24 hours a day for the interest of Russia? Where could it make a wiser expenditure than to support a group here, subsidize a party working in the interest of Russia; what could it do, over a long period of time, that would be in the better interest of the Soviet Union?

Mr. GITLOW. It could not do it in Russia. Communism is a one-party movement.

The CHAIRMAN. Exactly, so that from the standpoint of strategy and money well spent, it is money well spent for Russia to keep a party going in the United States, to build a party in the interest of the Russian Government.

Mr. GITLOW. No other government would try to finance such a movement; any other government undertaking to finance a hundred thousand men would have to pay an enormous amount of money; it would be far more—exceed by far the amount of money the Soviet Government spends in the United States to support communism here.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What would happen to those individuals?

Mr. GITLOW. Anywhere?

Mr. DEMPSEY. For instance, the representatives who were advocating or promoting the American system of government in Russia?

Mr. GITLOW. They would be lined up against the wall and shot.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In other words, their toes would be cut off close up to their ears.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. Just one further question. You have said that the Communist movement in Great Britain was not particularly strong.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. Would you say that is largely due to the attitude of the British trade-unions or the fact that the labor unions are strong there?

Mr. GITLOW. I think it would be due to the fact that the British trade-unions are much stronger, relatively speaking, than the same trade-union movements are in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions, gentlemen, before we adjourn?

Mr. THOMAS. One question relative to your statement concerning finances. How was that financing done in the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, the money was drawn in cash and then turned over to the party in cash, and the party deposited it in its own account in cash.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you recall what banks were used at that time?

Mr. GITLOW. As a matter of fact, we had deposits in a number of banks in Chicago, and I could not tell you offhand which they were. But that could be ascertained.

Mr. THOMAS. Any banks in New York City at that time?

Mr. GITLOW. I think we were depositing in the Corn Exchange Bank; the Corn Exchange Bank, at One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street and Park Avenue.

Mr. THOMAS. Were the accounts kept in the name of the Communist Party in the name of the officers?

Mr. GITLOW. When they were banked they were banked in the name of the party.

Mr. THOMAS. All accounts were kept in that way?

Mr. GITLOW. When the deposit of cash was made; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you maintain a cash vault, a savings deposit vault for cash, at headquarters or elsewhere?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, we never kept a vault; we did maintain a vault at one time.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, some of the cash did not go to the bank?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; sometimes it was held in the vault.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(At 3:10 p. m. an adjournment was taken until 10 a. m. of the following day, Friday, September 8, 1939.)

# INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1939

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE  
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Starnes, Casey, Mason, Voorhis, Thomas; also Mr. Rhea Whitley, counsel to the committee, and J. B. Matthews, Director of Research.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that at one time Mr. Lewis, John L. Lewis, charged that Mr. Brophy was an agent of Moscow, or of the Soviet Government, seeking to control or to destroy the United Mine Workers, and in view of the sworn testimony before this committee to the effect that Mr. Brophy had at one time acted as an agent for the Moscow or Soviet Russian Government, in that connection I think Mr. Brophy should be invited to make a statement or that he should be given an opportunity, if he so desires, to appear before this committee and make any statement in denial or explanation. I so move.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Starnes, will you tell the committee, for the sake of the record, what Mr. Brophy's present position is?

Mr. STARNES. Frankly, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, he is general director of the C. I. O., is my understanding—the national general director of the C. I. O. Last year, under oath, the same charge was made. Mr. Lewis, of course, made it in 1924; this witness makes reference to it under oath.

In view of the very prominent position Mr. Brophy holds, a key position in the labor movement, it becomes, I think, a very important matter, if the committee thinks he ought to be invited to appear here and answer these charges and one for all clear them up.

I may say, the last time that the charges were made, I addressed a letter to the Nonpartisan League and accorded them an opportunity to appear before the committee and answer these charges with reference to communism.

Is that agreeable to the committee, that the Chair extend him an opportunity to appear?

Mr. CASEY. I think that is eminently fair, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. And to have Mr. Brophy appear as soon as possible?

Mr. CASEY. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Or at his convenience, and the convenience of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. GITLOW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give some additional information on Brophy, in view of the statements that appeared in one of the Washington papers, in which Brophy denied having any contact with the Communists whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you do that, I just want to ask: Is that agreeable to the committee, that I do that?

Mr. CASEY. It is perfectly agreeable.

The CHAIRMAN. All in favor say "aye."

(The motion was unanimously carried.)

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

#### TESTIMONY OF BENJAMIN GITLOW—Resumed

Mr. GITLOW. I have the minutes with me of the political committee of November 25, 1927, in which the question of the party's campaign in the mining fields was discussed and Comrade Foster, who was in charge of the campaign, reported to the committee as follows—I am reading from the minutes of the political committee, of the central executive committee, of the Communist Party of the United States:

Comrade Foster reported on the proposed conference to be held on Saturday, especially in regard to Ho and Br.

"Ho" stands for "Alexander Howat" and "Br" stands for "Brophy."

Motions by Foster:

1. That the conference be postponed and taken up with Br when he comes here and then set the date.

That means taken up with Brophy.

2. That we send telegrams at once to Br telling him that the matter will be postponed and we will speak to him on Sunday.

3. Telegram to Howat, instructing him to wait for further instructions.

Then we have some more motions by Foster:

1. That Comrade Hapgood—

Hapgood at that time was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. CASEY. What was his first name?

Mr. GITLOW. Powers—Powers Hapgood.

1. That Comrade Hapgood be called before this polcom and made to explain what happened in connection with the liquidation of the publication of the paper and what he had to do with it at the first opportunity the polcom can reach him.

"Polcom" is the political committee. [Reading:]

Motions by Foster:

1. To set a new date for the conference and make a determined effort to get leading progressives to attend the conference—

And every time we made a motion to get leading progressives to attend the conference, we paid their railroad expenses and all other expenses.

Mr. STARNES. May I interrupt you there, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. By "leading progressives" you meant men of progressive thought and action in political and economic circles who were not members of the party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Is that what you mean by "progressives"?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes—in the trade-union movement, particularly.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. GITLOW (reading) :

\* \* \* and if we can get a substantial section of the progressives, that we issue a call for a general open conference.

2. That if the progressives that we were in contact with do not agree with this line of policy, that we propose to launch a paper immediately with Br as the editor and Ho as the field man—

"Br" is "Brophy" and "Ho" is Howat."

\* \* \* and our own comrades connected in strategic positions and through this paper carry on a sharp agitation calculated to bring things to a crisis and to force an open conflict with the Lewis machine in the shape of an open conference to be called by the party in as few weeks as possible after the launching of the paper.

Mr. STARNES. Therefore, Mr. Lewis, when he made his statement in the twenties—I do not recall whether it was 1924 or 1926—with reference to Mr. Brophy and Howat being Communists, was eminently correct?

Mr. GITLOW. He was correct as far as Powers Hapgood was concerned, not as far as Brophy was concerned. Brophy was not a member of the Communist Party, but worked with the Communist Party and received funds from the Communist Party, and his activities later in opposition of the miners' union were financed by the Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. I see.

The CHAIRMAN. After Brophy was expelled, what happened that caused Lewis and Brophy to get together, and Lewis to take back these expelled members?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, Lewis was victorious in the fight against Brophy; then Brophy pledged loyalty to the United Mine Workers again, and the C. I. O. organization created an entirely new situation, because the Communist Party supports the C. I. O. 100 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Today?

Mr. GITLOW. Today; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Communist Party has changed its attitude toward the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean toward the United Mine Workers?

Mr. GITLOW. Toward Lewis, yes; it has changed its attitude.

Mr. CASEY. As I understand it, Mr. Gitlow, you say that Mr. Brophy was not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROPHY. No.

Mr. MASON. But he was the direct agent of the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Handling funds for them in this campaign?

Mr. GITLOW. Brophy did not handle funds, but his expenses were paid, and his expenses involved leading the Brophy movement against John L. Lewis when Brophy was running for President against John L. Lewis; all those moneys came out of the treasury of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether or not Lewis and the Communists settled their differences?

Mr. GITLOW. They have settled their differences as far as the present situation is concerned, of course; otherwise you would not have the support that the Communist Party gives John L. Lewis today. And all you have to do is to follow the pages of the Daily Worker and you will see that every speech that Lewis makes is featured by the Communist Party. For example, take the Labor Day speeches: The Labor Day speech of William Green was not featured by the Daily Worker, but the Daily Worker featured the Labor Day speech of John L. Lewis. A page and a half was given to the Labor Day speech of John L. Lewis in the Daily Worker, and a two-column picture of him appeared, also.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, Lewis cannot help that.

Mr. GITLOW. No.

The CHAIRMAN. That might occur to anybody?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is no evidence that Lewis is favorable to or sympathetic with the Communists, is it?

Mr. GITLOW. No; that you would have to get from what Lewis does. But, of course, it is strange that Lewis is not attacking the Communists at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. Do Communists hold key positions in his organization?

Mr. GITLOW. That I could not tell you at present; I am not in a position to tell you that now.

Mr. CASEY. As I understand you now, all you say Mr. Brophy did was to accept money from the Communists to finance a campaign he had against Mr. Lewis, and to accept their comfort and their aid, but he was not a Communist himself?

Mr. GITLOW. Not only did he accept money and aid, but the Communist Party, in its political committee, outlined all the policies in the campaign, transmitted them to Brophy, and Brophy accepted those policies and carried them out. That is an important feature in the campaign to remember.

Mr. CASEY. The policies were questions of strategy in the campaign, were they not?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir; and all of the strategy and all of the policies were worked out by the Communist Party, by the political committee of the Communist Party. We would spend hours working out all of the strategy, all of the moves in the campaign, and then we had a special miners' committee, consisting of the following leaders of the party: C. E. Ruthenberg, general secretary of the party; William Z. Foster, head of the trade-union department; and J. Lovestone, and these three conferred continually with Brophy, Hapgood, and other progressives, and, with Brophy as leader, they transmitted to him the policies of the Communist Party in running the campaign and, to my knowledge, Brophy accepted these policies and carried them out.

Mr. STARNES. Who were some of those other progressives you conferred with at that time, Mr. Gitlow, please?

Mr. GITLOW. I cannot offhand think of them; I would have to look up the records, it is so far back. But I can supply the names.

Mr. STARNES. Will you be kind enough to refresh your recollection from the records and insert them in the testimony?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; when I deal with the trade-union matter, I will do that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Gitlow, in these meetings that Brophy had with these various people you mention, including Lovestone, did Brophy know at the time he was meeting with those men they were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course Brophy knew; Brophy knew that very well. There were no secrets about it. And he knew where the money was coming from, too; he knew it did not come from the miners; he knew it came from the Communist Party.

Mr. MASON. I would like to ask whether Sidney Hillman was one of those progressives who was in on this conference committee?

Mr. GITLOW. Sidney Hillman at that time had nothing to do with the miners' situation.

Mr. VOORHIS. As I understand, you are going to come back to the trade-union situation?

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that Mr. Earl Browder during his testimony gave considerable testimony with reference to the relationship between the Comintern in Moscow and the Communist Party in the United States, I would like at this time for Mr. Gitlow to go into that phase of the subject and clear up for the committee just what that relationship is, the extent of it, and the nature of it.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I am surprised to hear that Browder denies any connection, definite connection with and control by the Communist International of the Communist Party during his regime in the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think he did deny that. His testimony, as I understood it, was to the effect he used the word "agreement" for "discipline." He put it on the basis that while the Communist Party of the United States had always followed right along with the Comintern, that was the result of a voluntary agreement.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He does not put it in the language of "discipline" or "coercion," but the effect of it is the same, because he said if they did not agree they would have to get out of the party.

Mr. GITLOW. Well, that is a strange way in which to put the iron-clad control of the Communist Party today, and when Browder makes such a statement and can make it straight faced, that surprises me, because Browder is the last man that should make such a statement, because Browder was put into the position he now holds in the Communist Party by none other than Joseph Stalin himself. Stalin put Browder in his present position and supports him in that present position, and upon one occasion, when Browder was to be removed after he was general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, Joseph Stalin himself stepped in and saved Browder and kept him in the position he now holds. So when Browder can say there is no control of the Communist Party, that surprises me: I think it is really funny, if anything.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, Mr. Gitlow, Joseph Stalin placed Browder in the position as head of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. No one else did. Browder himself—

Mr. WHITLEY. And he has kept him in that position?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. Browder has been placed as the general secretary of the Communist Party by Joseph Stalin, and Browder is Stalin's pet boy in the United States, and Browder will do everything that Stalin wants him to do. If there is anybody that is subservient to Stalin in the United States, it is Earl Browder.

Mr. CASEY. What are the mechanics by which Stalin placed Browder in his present position?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I will deal with that later.

Mr. CASEY. I beg your pardon, if you are going to deal with that.

Mr. GITLOW. I have a special topic on that—on Stalin, Molotov, and the American party—and I will explain the whole operation.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, then, in your own way.

Mr. GITLOW. I think it is necessary for the committee to have some understanding of how the Communist Party is organized and how it is controlled by the Communist International and the role that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—that is, Stalin's party—plays in dominating the Communist International, because once you have an understanding, then you cannot fail to realize how completely Stalin controls the world Communist movement, and particularly the Communist Party of the United States.

I told you yesterday that the Communist Party is organized as a political organization and that its members receive orders on top, and once an order is given, they must carry out those orders explicitly.

In the Communist Party of the United States no referendum, no initiation of motions develops in the rank and file of the organization. Everything that happens in the Communist Party of the United States happens first in the political committee, or the central executive committee, or the secretariat of the Communist Party of the United States. They review all matters and make decisions, and these decisions are handed down as law to the districts and to the units and to the rank-and-file members of the party. At the same time you must keep in mind that the American Communist Party is a section of the Communist International, with headquarters in Moscow.

The Communist International was organized in 1920, and the man who played the decisive role in bringing about the organization of the Communist International was Lenin. Lenin and the other Bolshevik leaders in 1920 were of the opinion that the revolution which started in Russia, and in which they were the general staff, would not be confined to the borders of Russia itself, but would spread into Germany, France, and other countries, and would soon engulf the entire world in a world revolution. And they organized the Communist International as an international organization to handle the affairs of the world revolution—first, to prepare for it; and, second, when it developed, to guide it and to control it.

The parties which joined the Communist International had to accept certain provisions which made those parties sections of the Communist International that pledged themselves to carry out every order and every decision of the Communist International. In other words, the parties who joined the Communist International accepted the idea that the leadership of the Communist International was not only the leadership of the Communist International but also the leadership of all the parties which joined the Communist International, and that included the American Party as well.

But in organizing the Communist International a different provision was made for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In other words, the Russian Bolsheviks took for themselves a certain privileged position as far as their party is concerned. Whereas the American party and the German party and the French party had to carry out decisions of the Communist International explicitly, the Russian party was given a privileged position. The Russian party was permitted not only to review all decisions of the Communist International, but, if necessary, to take it up in its political committee and to change those decisions. Let us say, for example, that the Communist International made a certain decision which all the other Communist parties accepted, and then the Russian party, for some reason or other, decided that that decision was a wrong one: They could take it up in the political committee of the Russian Communist Party, make a different decision, and that decision becomes binding upon the parties of the Communist International.

Another important fact to bear in mind is that in organizing the Communist International, the rules governing the Communist International provide that whenever a party sends representatives to the Communist International, or delegates to the congresses of the Communist International, those delegates cannot be instructed. In other words, the American party, when it sends delegates to a Communist International congress, or representatives to the Communist International, under the rules governing the Communist International, cannot instruct those delegates on what are the wishes of the American party or its membership, but they must go to the Communist International uninstructed. The only party that has the right to instruct its delegates to the Communist International and to make those instructions binding on the delegates is the Russian Communist Party. That is the only party that can issue instructions, and the instructions which the Russian party gives to its delegates in turn are binding instructions, and become the rules of the Comintern. In other words, they have built the Communist International organization in such a way that the Russians under no circumstances can lose control of the Communist International. From the very start they made sure that the Communist International organization would not present difficulties to the Russian party, and that it would be an organization on an international scale, serving the interests, first, of the Soviet Union internally, and, second, serving their interests externally wherever such interests had to be served. That you must keep in mind in any matter concerning the relationship between the Communist Party and Moscow.

I know that it is very difficult for the average American to really understand the mass organizational structure which we find in the Communist Party. I would say that the Communist Party of the United States is like gigantic machine with gears and wheels within gears. There are a variety of organizational forms that are puzzling to the average man; but it is through these organizational forms that the party is able to operate in practically every field of American life, and in places where you would least suspect them to be active, you will find the party active in those fields.

Mr. VOORHIS. What that really means is that not only is the American Communist Party controlled by the Communist International,

but that it is actually controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which means that it is controlled by Joseph Stalin; so that the Communist Party in the United States is really controlled by Stalin.

Mr. GITLOW. I would say that the control of the party's affairs by Stalin in Russia is as absolute as the control of Hitler over the affairs of his German party in Germany. I believe that the direction and control of Stalin over the affairs of the party in Russia is more monopolistic than the control of the Fuehrer Hitler over the affairs of his party in Germany, as I think history will soon show.

Mr. WHITLEY. When you say that it is Joseph Stalin who directs and controls the Communist Party in Russia, it is synonymous to saying that Joseph Stalin is the head and controls the Communist Party here.

Mr. GITLOW. Joseph Stalin is the boss of the Communist Party there and is the "boss Murphy" of the Communist Party here in the United States.

Mr. STARNES. Will you proceed now and tell us how this organization works—giving instances of how it works?

Mr. GITLOW. When an American citizen or any person joins the Communist Party, he throws himself under the discipline of the party and he must do whatever the party directs him to do. As I said, it is like joining the marines. Those who join the marines are soldiers, and whatever commands their superior officers give the marines or soldiers must carry it out. Membership in the Communist Party is divided according to the organizations to which they belong, the particular fields in which they are active, and the work which they are best able to do. In other words, when you become a member of the Communist Party, you become a member of a unit or subsection of the party organization, and then the government of your whole life and work is done by the party. Then you are assigned to a certain party organization where you will fit in best, according to the leaders of the party. The membership after that is then divided into the unions in which they work, and the kind of enterprises they work for, and the kind of service they can render to the party. This form of organization is called the fraction form of organization, although I believe Mr. Browder stated that the fraction form of organization no longer exists in the Communist Party. While they have overcome the name "fraction," or, if they object to organizing their members the way they formerly approved in fractions, they have a number of branches for the particular activities in which they are organized.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, they have substituted the word "branch" for "fraction"?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir; let me give an example of how this works: Let us say that in the Pittsburgh district we have 50 members of the Communist Party who are members of the United Mine Workers of America. Those 50 members are constituted into a fraction to take up the mining problems, or the problems of the union to which they belong, which the party wants to carry out, and they are to obey the decisions relative to the mining industry in reference to the activities of the union to which they belong. The party makes the decisions and the comrades carry them out. In addition to that, all members

of the Communist Party are assigned to front organizations, and in those front organizations they constitute a Communist nucleus or a Communist fraction which directs the affairs of the organization.

Another point is the fact that Communist Party members work in industries which are of vital importance for military purposes, or industries which use important industrial secrets. Those members are brought to the attention of the secretariat of the party, and whenever it is advisable to obtain information from them in reference to military secrets or industrial secrets that is done. The party members are also organized into special groups.

The CHAIRMAN. Right there, I do not want to interrupt you, but I think this is timely: Do you mean to state that where a fraction or branch is in a munitions factory or in a navy yard, it would be their duty, if the Communist leadership directed them to do so, to bring them certain secrets or disclose certain secrets and information within the Navy or Army, or wherever they were working? Do I understand that it would be their primary duty to comply with that direction?

Mr. GITLOW. Absolutely, and those things have been done.

Mr. STARNES. In that connection, when they obtain military secrets or industrial secrets relative to the plans for machines, plants, and so forth, are they transmitted to Moscow?

Mr. THOMAS. In other words, does this top organization, when one of these Communists is employed in some munitions works or in an industrial plant, become practically a spy for the Soviet Union?

Mr. GITLOW. If he is designated for that purpose; yes. They have selected people for that, and wherever they want to use them, they do.

Mr. THOMAS. They are in key positions in the industry?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Would that apply to the Government service, also?

Mr. GITLOW. A Communist member has only one loyalty, and that is to the party, and that applies to every service in which they are engaged.

Mr. STARNES. Would you say that where a Communist member was placed in a Government position, in a responsible Government position, the same rule would apply to him as would apply if he were employed in a private industry?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Has there been any effort made along that line in Government employment?

Mr. GITLOW. During my period there was a slight effort along the line of industrial and military secrets. I do not know how far they have developed it up to this date.

The CHAIRMAN. During your time, they did not make any effort to place members in the Government service?

Mr. GITLOW. Not at that time.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would that same policy apply with reference to sabotage activities? If a Communist were working in a munitions plant or industry and received instructions to commit sabotage in the place, he would carry out those instructions. Is that true?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir; for example, if it became necessary, according to the policy laid down by the Communist International, or if the United States, we will say, were at war with the Soviet Union, or if the United States were to enter into a war in which the Soviet Union was allied to Nazi Germany, it would be the first duty of the Com-

munists working in such a factory, if sabotage played an important role, and he would not hesitate to enter into any acts of sabotage.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the party in America particularly want to get its members into certain industries, as, for instance, the munitions industry, or into communication organizations, Army, shipyards, and so forth? Does it pay particular attention to certain industries of that type that might have military importance?

Mr. GITLOW. The industries in which the party was particularly interested in gaining a foothold, because of their strategic position in international developments, were the following: One was the marine industry. In the marine industry the Communist International has been very active in establishing bureaus and organizations in all the important ports throughout the world.

Mr. THOMAS. Right at that point, I hate to interrupt, but I would like to ask this: Do you not think that in the case of those liners, the Communists are taking a hand in the strikes in and around New York, which are delaying the sailing of those vessels?

Mr. GITLOW. I would not speak of matters that I am not acquainted with. I do not know. In the marine industry, they have established port bureaus in New York, port bureaus at New Orleans, port bureaus at San Francisco, port bureaus in the Latin American countries, Brazil, Argentina, and Montevideo, and other places. Organizations to gain influence over the marine workers were established in the important ports in Europe and Asia. In other words, the Communist International made a very serious effort to gain control of the workers in the marine industry, because those workers, as you can readily realize, in a war situation hold a key position.

Another industry in which they attempted to get workers placed and to make serious contact with was the chemical industry. That was started during the period when I held a leading position in the party. In Moscow the importance of chemicals in the field of warfare was seriously considered, and Moscow was very anxious to get whatever information it could on the development of chemical warfare. Our party here in the United States tried to contact the chemical industry, but we had very few workers employed in the chemical plants of the country at that particular time. Whether they have been able to make such contact now, I do not know. Those basic industries have played an important role, not only for gaining organized support for the Communist Party, but for other considerations as well, and the Comintern admonished the American party continuously to gain a foothold in the basic industries of the country, notably, coal, automobiles, coal mines, and the steel industry. We had met with success in the needle trades, textiles, and so forth, but had met with no real success in the basic industries, and the Communist International criticized us and continually demanded that we gain a foothold in the basic industries in this country.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is meant by colonizing the members in basic strategic industries?

Mr. GITLOW. By colonizing, let us say, for example, we wanted members in the chemical industry of the United States: We would canvas the membership of the party, and we would send secret instructions down to the D. O., or the district organizers, asking them whether they had members qualified to obtain positions in chemical

plants. If they had such members, we would direct that they proceed to do that. Colonizing was also done with the youth organizations in the military training camps during the summer, set up by the National Guard. We directed the youth organization to send a number of Communist Party members into those camps to gain military knowledge or military instruction. That was done during my time.

Mr. STARNES. Does that apply to the C. M. T. C.?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. That is what you have reference to particularly?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Suppose you continue with your discussion of the relations.

Mr. WHITLEY. In addition to what I have said, contact of the Communist International is maintained by a system of ambassadors, as we call them, from the Communist International to the United States. And, also, of American party members to the Communist International. In other words, we have ambassadors from the Communist International in America to look after the affairs of the American party, and we send representatives to the Communist International who will live in Moscow, and attend meetings of the Communist International, and get instructions regarding policies, tactics, and orders of the Communist International.

As to the American representatives to the Communist International, I will mention a few of them. When I speak of the Communist International I also speak of the Red International Trade Unions—the Red International of Trade Unions, which is a subsidiary of the Communist International. In other words, a small committee of the International runs the work of the Red International Labor Union.

Mr. WHITLEY. If Mr. Browder, when he testified, said that this exchange of ambassadors, as you call them, does not exist, that would be incorrect?

Mr. GITLOW. Absolutely incorrect, and I will give you the names of the American representatives and the names of the Comintern representatives.

Mr. WHITLEY. Also, if Mr. Browder said that there was no direct relationship between the Red International Labor Union and the Comintern, would that be an accurate statement?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I think that would be some of the intellectual gymnastics of Browder, but would have no basis in fact.

This is only a partial list, and I have a complete list of the representatives of the Communist International to the United States over a period of years, but this is only a partial list, but it will give you an idea of how this is done.

Petersen was a Scandinavian comrade sent by the Communist International.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall the approximate year?

Mr. GITLOW. The approximate year was 1926, I believe—1925 or 1926.

A very important representative of the Communist International was one Gussev, who went under the names of Green and Gray in the American party.

Then we have another Communist International who went under the name of Brown, so we have Brown, Green, and Gray.

Gussev was a very important representative. He was sent here at the instance of Joseph Stalin at the time Joseph Stalin was preparing action against Trotsky, and his special mission in the United States was to line up the American party for the elimination of Trotsky from the International and the Russian Communist movement.

Gussev, when he came to the United States, was a member of the very powerful control commission of the Russian Communist Party. The control committee is the body which has the power to discipline the ruling clique of Russia, and he was a member of that committee. Gussev, in addition, was a member of the Russian Military Academy, and one of Russia's military experts, and he was sent to this country, to the American Communist Party, as a representative of the Communist International.

Mr. MASON. What year was that, if you please?

Mr. GITLOW. 1925.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder testified he did not know that Gussev was a Comintern representative to the United States.

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I think Browder hesitates too much, I think, about things he likes to forget. That is my opinion.

Another gentleman that was sent here was a Finnish Communist organizer by the name of Sirola, and who operated in this country under the name of Miller. He was here in 1925 and 1926.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know what Sirola's first name was?

Mr. GITLOW. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You just knew him by the one name of Sirola?

Mr. GITLOW. I knew the man very well, and I liked him. He was an intelligent man, but he has been purged in the purges that took place.

Mr. THOMAS. What do you mean by purged?

Mr. GITLOW. When they purge somebody he ceases to exist, like that which occurred in the June 1930 purge of Hitler. We know all about the purges of Stalin in Russia against the old Bolsheviks.

Mr. STARNES. That is where they disagreed with him?

Mr. GITLOW. Where they disagree with the head of the party, or where the head of the party wants to eliminate them. But we have no purges here.

Mr. THOMAS. We did have some attempts at purges here, but the purges here would not be the same as over there; the purge here would be by the ballot.

Mr. GITLOW. The ballot is not a purge.

Mr. THOMAS. Except that it has been so referred to lately.

Mr. GITLOW. Another representative sent here was Marcus, who also went under the name of Jenks. The representative sent here by the Communist International to deal with our youth organization was an English Communist by the name of Rust. He was sent here in 1927.

In 1928 and 1929 the Communist International sent two representatives to the American party. At that time—and I will speak later in reference to their activities—one was Harry Pollit, the leader of the British Communist Party, and the other was one Dengel, one of the leaders of the Communist Party of Germany.

In 1927 the Communist International sent us a German Communist, a member of the central executive committee of the German party, by the name of Ewart, who, in the Communist International went under

the name of Braun, and who operated in the United States under the name of Brown.

In 1921-22 the Communist International sent us a representative who came also with plenty of cash, under the name of Scott. That was his pseudonym; his real name was Johnson. He originally went to Russia from the United States in 1919 and became a member of the Russian Communist Party.

In 1922 the Communist International sent three representatives to the American Communist Party. One of them was Boris Rhinestein, who, after he arrived in the United States for a long time, was a resident of Buffalo, N. Y., and was a member of the Socialist Labor Party. When the revolution broke out he went to Moscow and became a Soviet citizen and a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and an important figure in the International Labor Union.

They also sent us John Pepper, whose real name is John Pogany.

John Pogany, or Pepper, as we knew him in this country, was commander in chief of the Red Army of Soviet Hungary in 1920 or 1921—I am not sure of the date—and when the Soviet Government of Hungary, of which Bela Kun was the head, was overthrown, he escaped with his wife and family and he was sent to the United States as a representative of the party in 1922.

These were the three representatives sent to the party in 1922.

The chief representative of the three was a mathematician, a professor from Poland, who lived in Russia and was a member of the Russian Communist Party, and whose name was Valetzky, and Valetzky has, by the way, been purged.

In other words, this old-time Communist has been purged by Joseph Stalin.

Now, you see, over an extended period of time the party was never without representatives of the Communist International to see to it that the American party carried out the orders of the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you know all these representatives over this period of time personally?

Mr. GITLOW. I knew all of them personally.

Mr. WHITLEY. You carried on business with them?

Mr. GITLOW. I carried on business with all of them and knew all of them very well.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether Mr. Earl Browder knew at least some of these representatives personally?

Mr. GITLOW. Earl Browder knew all of these representatives personally.

Mr. WHITLEY. He knew who they were and who they represented?

Mr. GITLOW. According to my knowledge, he met with all of them, and that is positive knowledge; that he met with all of these representatives.

Mr. WHITLEY. If I recall correctly, Mr. Browder, when he was testifying under oath in the early part of this week, said that he only knew of one instance in which a representative of the Comintern had been sent to this country. I believe he stated that Harry Pollit was the only such representative he had ever known to be acting in that capacity.

Mr. GITLOW. I think Browder must be in his second childhood. He ought to have his brain examined to see what is the matter with his memory.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did any of the Comintern representatives in the United States serve on the central executive committee of the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. I am coming to that.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you also tell us how they came in, whether they did come in openly on regular passports?

Mr. GITLOW. Every one of these representatives came in on fictitious passports and by circuitous routes, and arrangements for bringing them into the country were taken up with the party in the United States so there would be no slip up in the arrangements worked out.

Mr. WHITLEY. Entirely secret and underground procedure?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; absolutely.

Now, I am going to give you some of the names of representatives of the American party to the Communist International.

In 1919 we sent to the Communist International John Reed and Louis Fraina, and Nicholas Hourwich.

Then there were representatives of the American party, Israel Amter and Max Bedacht, to the Comintern; Robert Minor, Louis Engdahl, Earl Browder, Harrison George, H. M. Wicks, William W. Weinstone, Juliet Stuart Poyntz, and then I will deal with some others, and that is just a brief list, with some other phases of the Communist International organization later on, and what people we sent there.

Here is an interesting characteristic of the powers and the special privileges which representatives of the Communist International enjoyed in the United States, not only in their activities in America, but also as to the special powers which they enjoyed.

A representative of the Communist International to the United States during his stay in the United States was the boss of the party. In other words, he could step into the central committee of the party and say, "I, as a representative of the Communist International, using my mandate, order the American party to do this thing and that thing and something else," and that had to be carried out.

In other words, he was commander in chief of the party while in the United States. He automatically became a member of all the leading committees of the party in the United States and participated in its deliberations and enjoyed a vote on matters that were voted upon, and if he happened to be in the minority in the vote, when he wanted the minority to be the majority, all he had to do was to impose his power and mandate as a C. I. representative, and then his view would prevail. Generally, American Communists never would take a position in opposition to the representative of the Communist International; they knew his special powers in the country.

So you can see how closely knit and tied up the American party was to the Communist International, and it is inconceivable to believe that the Bolshevik leaders of the Communist International and particularly a political boss of the character of Stalin would forego that control at this stage of the game, particularly when it is needed so much, in view of the critical situation.

They might camouflage the control and they might declare it does not exist, but practically and intrinsically it does exist, and that control has never been given up, because if that control had been given up then you see, as Browder has testified, that never, on any occasion, has the Communist Party of the United States during his period as

general secretary of the party been in opposition on any matter of authority with the Russian Communist Party, the Communist International.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What is the purpose of the American Communist Party: is it to change our form of government to that which now exists in Russia?

Mr. GITLOW. Precisely.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And the members of the Communist Party who are citizens of this country owe their first allegiance to the Government of Moscow?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Then, as a matter of fact, to say the best of them, they are just undesirable citizens of this country.

Mr. GITLOW. Under the present situation, I would declare so.

Mr. STARNES. The same practice, I presume, obtained with reference to obtaining passports for experts who have come to this country as for those going to Russia?

Mr. GITLOW. I will deal with the passport question later. That will form a special phase of the question.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. GITLOW. In addition to having representatives of the American party to the Communist International, American party members served on very important missions for the Communist International in all parts of the world. In other words, if the Communist International wanted to do a specific job in China and reached the conclusion that that specific job could be done best by an American Communist, the American Communist was selected to do the job, and he was supplied with the funds and the authority, and sent on a special mission to China, and the result was that American Communists have traveled to all four corners of the earth as special missionaries of the Communist International.

Browder himself had charge of very important missions of the Communist International. He was sent to China and he established a paper in China. He had charge of a bureau in China.

Wicks was sent to Germany and to Latin America and to other parts of the world.

William Dunne was sent to France and to Germany and to other parts of the world.

Zack—I forget his first name—also was sent on missions to various countries, notably to Latin America.

Krumbein was sent on a special mission to Great Britain and to other countries.

Jack Johnstone was sent on all kinds of missions, but the most important one was to India.

Harrison George went on missions that took him to many countries. Let me see if I can think of a few more offhand.

Philip Aronberg was sent on missions to China and other countries.

Then we had in the Communist Party a taximan, a sailor, as we knew him. He never was in the marine industry, but he was assigned to it, and there was also a fellow by the name of George Mink. George Mink visited on official business for the Comintern, practically every country of the world.

So you see that is how the American party was utilized by the Communist International.

In other words, it is a part of the whole structure, and used wherever it is best to use the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. I beg your pardon for interrupting you at this point, but I believe, if my memory serves me right, when Mr. Browder testified in the early part of the week he stated that he knew a George Mink, but he was very indefinite whether he knew him, and I do not believe he even admitted that he knew him personally; at least, if he did, he indicated a very passing acquaintance with him and knew nothing about him.

Do you know whether Mr. Browder has ever had any association with George Mink?

Mr. GITLOW. George Mink and Mr. Browder were the closest friends in the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Personal and party friends?

Mr. GITLOW. Very close personal friends and at the same time very close party friends. They were leaders in the same party faction and they continuously palled together.

At the same time, as an agent of the Profintern Mink was closely associated with Browder on many committee activities, so if there is any person in the American party that Earl Browder knows well, very well, that is George Mink.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you recall whether a party named Kwite performed any special missions for the Comintern, and also whether Kwite was known as Sparks?

Mr. GITLOW. I think Kwite served on special missions to the Comintern. He was not a seaman, but was assigned to our activities among the seamen and served on many important missions. In the party he was known under the name of Sparks.

Mr. WHITLEY. I ask that question because, if my recollection is correct, Mr. Browder testified that Kwite was not known in the party or known to him as Sparks.

Mr. GITLOW. You would have to find out from Browder why he does not remember.

Mr. WHITLEY. He does know Kwite?

Mr. GITLOW. According to my knowledge he should know him and know him very well.

Mr. STARNES. Is that the same Sparks who is now a secretary in Wisconsin?

Mr. GITLOW. I could not tell you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, do you know whether Mink is a relative of Losovsky?

Mr. GITLOW. Mink claims to be a relative of Losovsky, formerly head of the Red International Labor Union, and who is today assistant commisar of foreign affairs, first assistant to Molotov.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder was not familiar with the fact when he was examined the other day, according to his testimony.

Mr. GITLOW. The work in the Communist International organization is also divided into departments. One of the important departments of the Communist International is the information department of the Communist International, and all Communist parties have representatives in Moscow who are known as the official representatives to the information department.

The duties of a representative to the information department are to keep close watch on the activities of the party, and they send a

report on those activities to the Executive Committee of the Communist International; in other words, to keep them supplied with thorough and complete reports of the activities of the Communist Party which sent him. If he is sent by the Communist Party of the United States, he must report on the activities of the American Communists.

In addition to that, he must follow in detail the political and other developments in the country from which he comes and report on those developments to the Executive Committee of the Communist International, and whatever other information they may desire to get from the other countries he gets. In other words, he is a source of intimate information to the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the representative from the party to the International?

Mr. GITLOW. To the information department of the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is one of the functions that those party representatives perform while they are assigned at the Comintern?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. The representative to the information department is a very important representative because he is the source of great information.

Then we also have representatives to the cooperative department in the Communist International. We have a cooperative department which looks over the world cooperative movement, and we have a representative who is acquainted with the American cooperatives in the cooperative department.

Then there is a women's department, and we have representatives in the women's department, and we also have an agitation and a propaganda department, and we have a representative in the agitation and propaganda department.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, approximately how many representatives of a party in a particular country are assigned to the Comintern at all times? You mentioned a number of departments to which they are assigned.

Mr. GITLOW. At one time you may have more in Moscow and another time less. At one time we may have in Moscow as many as 50 members engaged in various activities for the Communist International and at another time there may be considerably less, depending upon the particular situation. There is no definite number, but I would say when we have had official people in Moscow at no time is the number less than a dozen people in Moscow.

In addition to that, the Communist International has established a number of colleges for the purpose of training professional revolutionists. In other words, the Communist International is very much interested in developing professional revolutionists. people who would devote all their time to the Communist cause and to the Communist organization, and for that purpose they created in Moscow a number of schools and universities and to these schools and universities we sent students. The American party sends these students over to Moscow, to the highest schools, and the schools to which only the most promising members of the party were sent, and the school to which even leaders of the party were sent is known as the Lenin Institute, and the allotment to the Lenin Institute in recent years,

when I was the top leader of the party we sent around 20 students to the Lenin Institute, and they took up a 3-year course in the Lenin Institute on all matters of Communist strategy and policy and everything required of a Communist leader.

For instance, Hathaway, now the editor of the Daily Worker, is a graduate of the Lenin Institute.

Then they had a Far Eastern University. The Far Eastern University was the university of which Joseph Stalin was particularly proud, and to that university the Communist Parties were supposed to send those members who were interested in becoming active in the Far East and among the colonial peoples of the world, and we sent about 30 to the Far Eastern University, and among them was a large percentage, I would say more than half, Negroes, members of the party. So we could train them or they could be trained to be active in the colonial uprisings if they would take place in Africa and in other places.

Mr. STARNES. Is that for the Southeastern section of the United States also?

Mr. GITLOW. And also to take care of the Negro problems in America.

Mr. STARNES. Particularly in the South, where there are large numbers of them.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In addition to the usual studies, which I presume were taught at the Lenin Institute, such as economics and politics and political strategy, were there any special courses not usual in an educational institution?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I will submit, in connection with the importance of the Lenin Institute, that the students of the Lenin Institute were all assigned to very important committees of the Profintern and the Communist International. So they got first-hand knowledge of Communist International policy in important situations and in handling important situations, and became not only well-versed on theoretical education, but they got a practical education in leadership, policy, and strategy.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe that in the past the statement or the allegation has been made that they taught such courses as street fighting, and how to stir up political strife and disorders, and also gave the students at the institute military training under the official trainers of the Red Army. Do you know whether that is correct or not?

Mr. GITLOW. They got a course in military training. They formed a special section of the military in Moscow. They paraded during May day, carrying the rifles that they practiced with; that is true.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just one other interruption, Mr. Gitlow. Do you know whether a party by the name of Bosse was at any time a representative in the information department of the Comintern, and what his duties were?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. Bosse was one of our representatives to the information department of the Communist International from 1927, I believe, to 1929.

Mr. WHITLEY. He was the American party representative to the information department.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, do you know whether this Bosse has ever worked for Amtorg under the name of Shipman?

Mr. GITLOW. That I am not in a position to tell you, because I do not know. Maybe later on he did, but in my time he did not work for the Amtorg.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether his real name, or one of his aliases, is Brooks?

Mr. GITLOW. That I do not know, because he was known at that time in the party under the name of Bosse, and he served as information man of the American party in Moscow under the name of Bosse.

Mr. STARNES. Do you recall the names of some of the students who were sent to the School of Leninism?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I can recall them.

Mr. STARNES. Will you recall some of those names for us, just for the purpose of the record?

Mr. GITLOW. Krumbein.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is Charles Krumbein?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; who is now secretary of the largest district of the Communist Party, the New York district.

Hathaway, who is now editor of the Daily Worker. Margaret Undjus; I do not know what position she holds now. Barney Herman. Joseph Zack. Those are some, but there were many more.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know Richard Wright?

Mr. GITLOW. No.

Mr. STARNES. You do not know Richard Wright?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I do not know him.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether the Lenin Institute is still in operation? Of course, the last date of your own knowledge that you know of students being sent there would be in 1929, is that correct?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. So you could not testify from your own knowledge that students are being sent there now.

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I am of the opinion that these institutes have been abolished in Russia at the present time because of the peculiar internal situation in Russia; the changes and shifts in policy which have taken place in Russia, and the general fear of foreigners inside of the Soviet Union. In my opinion, they have cut down the infiltration of such foreigners that would make up student bodies, and so forth, to a minimum. Whether they have done that entirely, I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You qualify that by expressing it just as an opinion and not as a fact.

Mr. GITLOW. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, do you recall that a girl by the name of Helen Kay, who was the editor of the Young Pioneer for a period, was one of the students of the Lenin Institute?

Mr. GITLOW. Helen Kay was one of the students of the Lenin Institute, and she was also active in the food-workers' industry.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And she was the first secretary of the League of Women Shoppers in this country; do you know that?

Mr. GITLOW. That I do not know. But I know who Helen Kay is.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know Robert Hall?

Mr. GITLOW. I know Robert Hall; yes. He was a Lenin student. He is a Negro comrade.

Mr. STARNES. And he went to this Lenin Institute?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

**Mr. WHITLEY.** Will you continue, Mr. Gitlow?

**Mr. GITLOW.** Now, I have a voluminous amount of records here which I think it would be important for the committee to become acquainted with, which prove without the question of a doubt the intimate relationship of the party with the Communist International and how completely the Communist International controlled the American party.

**The CHAIRMAN.** I think it would be important to get each and every one of the documents in the record, because that is one of the main issues involved.

**Mr. WHITLEY.** I would suggest that you identify the document for us and then read the pertinent portions of it.

**Mr. GITLOW.** Just the important parts.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Do you not think that the whole of the documents ought to go into the record?

**Mr. WHITLEY.** Then we will put the whole document in the record.

**Mr. STARNES.** You can offer it as an exhibit.

**Mr. WHITLEY.** And have it published as part of the official record.

**The CHAIRMAN.** You can retain your originals, but I think all of these documentary records should be made a part of our record, verbatim, just as they are.

**Mr. STARNES.** I would like, if Mr. Gitlow has access to the records and knows of his own knowledge the names of the students who went to this school of Leninism through the period of years that he has referred to—I would like him to set those out in the record, indicating who they are and identifying them with party activities.

**Mr. WHITLEY.** Mr. Gitlow, in identifying those, was referring only to the ones that were sent over there while he was one of the top functionaries of the party in this country. He knows of his own knowledge that they were sent and the purposes for which they were sent.

**Mr. STARNES.** I understand that. But he has testified from memory. I want him to refresh his recollection and put all the names in that he can get.

**Mr. WHITLEY.** Yes.

**Mr. GITLOW.** We had a standing joke in the Communist Party which ran as follows: Why is the Communist Party like the Brooklyn Bridge? And the answer was because it is suspended on cables. In other words, it was suspended on cables from Moscow and to Moscow.

I have here only a minimum record of some of these cables, which crossed the wires, which hummed across the wires, from the United States to Moscow and from Moscow to the United States. The cost of these cables run into thousands of dollars, because some of these cables are very lengthy cables.

Just to give you an example of some of them. Here I have a cable which was sent by the Communist International to the American Party, October 13, 1926, for the Presidium of the executive committee of the Communist International, and was signed by the secretary of the Communist International.

It says:

POLCOM, October 13, 1926.

CABLEGRAM FROM E. C. C. I.

Because of the differences that exist in the party on the question whether the Central Committee of the party is to be removed from Chicago to New York, the

Presidium of the E. C. C. I., although recognizing the weightiness of the arguments that have been brought forward by the majority of the political committee, is of the opinion that such a decision should be made unanimously. If unanimity in this question cannot be reached, then the decision in this question should be left to the next party convention.

Concerning the removal of the daily organ before the convention to New York, the Presidium leaves the decision of this question to the political committee.

For Presidium of E. C. C. I.

KUUSINEN.

*Read and destroy.* Please note decision of Polcom relative to the cable.

You can see from this cable how such a minor question, which should be within the province of the party itself, the question of removing the national headquarters from Chicago to New York and of removing the Daily Worker from Chicago to New York had to be considered by the executive committee of the Communist International, and the executive committee of the Communist International had to make a decision in the matter before the party could take steps in this direction. And this cable that I have read was the cable that was sent on that momentous question.

Mr. WHITLEY. After the receipt of that cable, did the executive committee of the party in this country decide unanimously on the question as suggested in the cable, or do you recall?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, we moved. I do not remember the date, but I know that the national office of the party was moved to New York. The Daily Worker was moved to New York. The Trade Union Educational League was moved to New York. The I. L. D., the International Labor Defense, was moved to New York. All the important party organizations which had their national headquarters in Chicago at the time moved to New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. But before that could be done it had to be passed on in Moscow.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes: surely. Moscow pays the bills and Moscow controls the party.

Now, we have here another cable. I am just reading them at random, to give you some idea of these matters. This was sent from Moscow and was signed by Cannon, Foster, and William Weinstone. They happened to be in Moscow at this time discussing American affairs with the Communist International. This was sent on July 30, 1927. The cable is a long one, and do not forget that charges from Moscow to the United States are expensive.

(Mr. Gitlow interpolated during the reading of the above cablegram, as follows:)

Moscow, July 30, 1927.

Two days' delay, resolution not basically changed. Four points one danger our position. Criticizes Corker editorials, British meetings correct. Two, bourgeoisification ours? Complete. Menacing movement. Study. Combat. Several pages analysis. Ideological corruption far wider than material. Pepper attempted change policy of reorganizing labor banks into cooperatives defeated. Three, union work T. U. E. L. complete. Criticize Batt, head on Zack dualism. Dunne struggle underestimate role T. U. E. L. Four, Intein Al. Polcom responsible factionalism. Parity commission six members, two candidates. Jay Bill secretaries, also deputy chairmen, parity commission. Convention middle August.

(Signed) JIM BILL WILL.

Foster at that time maintained that the workers in the United States were becoming bourgeois and that was the reason communism was not making headway. So he said the Communist International accepted that position.

Foster had the illusion that we Communists in the United States could change the labor banks into purely cooperative enterprises.

Zack was charged with being in favor of dual unionism.

I want to read these cables. Here are four cables sent in 1927 by the Communist International to the American party.

The CHAIRMAN. We want those to go into the record in full and then they will be returned to you.

FIRST C. I. CABLE

"Declaration of the Communist International on the factional situation in the Workers (Communist) Party." The Comintern is categorically against the sharpening of the factional struggle and under no circumstances supports the statement of "The National Committee of the Opposition Bloc." The Comintern recognizes that in many political questions the Ruthenberg group followed a more correct line in the past than the Foster group. On the other hand, the executive is of the opinion that the Ruthenberg group had not understood how to estimate sufficiently the full significance of the trade-union forces in the party and that Foster at that time was more correct on many trade-union questions. The line of the Comintern has been, on the whole, for the political support of the Ruthenberg group and for bringing Foster nearer to the political line of the Ruthenberg group, at the same time, however, following the course toward the correction of the trade-union tactics of the Ruthenberg group on the line of Foster through cooperation in the party leadership. Now the previous political and trade-union differences have almost disappeared. The Comintern condemns most categorically every attempt toward the sharpening of the situation in the party, especially in the present objective situation as exemplified by the formation of a national committee of the opposition bloc. The Comintern considers factionalism without political differences as the worst offense against the party. Signed Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

SECOND C. I. CABLE

You must publish immediately the following: "Our cable of July 7 did not aim at all to support the hegemony of one group in the Workers Party but the merging of all groups. We criticized the factional action of the national committee of the opposition bloc; we criticized also the narrow inner party line of the other side. Between the representatives of the three groups an agreement has been reached here to facilitate the bringing nearer and to accelerate the merging of these groups. Every action standing in contradiction to this agreement, no matter which side it should come from, is condemned and categorically rejected by us in the interests of party unity. According to the agreement, the opposition shall also have the right to express and defend in a nonfactional, comradely way its opinions in all meetings of the party units.

PRESIDIUM E. C. C. I.

THIRD C. I. CABLE

E. C. C. I. considers such methods struggle as opposition group uses in statement impermissible factional, such expressions styling majority of Polcom "petty bourgeois intellectuals" as "clique leadership" are opposed resolution of E. C. C. I. and agreement of American comrades serving only to poison party life. E. C. C. I. most decisively opposes these faction methods. On other hand, E. C. C. I. declares against any disciplinary measures against opposition.

(Signed) PRESIDIUM E. C. C. I.

FOURTH C. I. CABLE

Presidium E. C. C. I. considers that in view of the urgent necessity for party to conduct as great a fight as possible against intervention and counterrevolutionary war of American imperialists in China and Nicaragua, and also difficult position of the party arising out of the attacks of the Government and the trade-union bureaucracy, the Presidium cannot accept proposal for delegates to come to Moscow. We invite all groups to formulate in writing their reasons for views expressed in telegrams received. We categorically insist there be no changes in the Political Bureau or other leading positions in the party until the party

convention and, on the other hand, we are against organizational measures against the minority. Dispute re party convention will be decided upon receipt of respective written statements. We insist upon the laying aside of factional fighting.

Here is a cable by Lovestone, from Moscow, dealing with the decisions taken by the Communist International on the American party:

DEAR COMRADE: The following cablegram in regard to the attitude of the leaders of the Comintern toward our party and its leadership has been received from Comrade Lovestone:

"Very important joint meeting, our delegation with Russian delegation, highly satisfactory. Bittelman demanded letter sharply criticizing our party on T. U. E. L. and dozen other points, demanding organization changes in Jewish and south Slavic sections, and dictating modification of inner line. Losovsky supported Bittelman and attacked our T. U. E. L. and textile policy, but was completely isolated. All other ignored Bittelman's 14 points and upheld present policies of party. Piatnitsky very mildly critical of T. U. E. L. delay, but highly praised organizational improvements and big achievements past year. Bueharin and Stalin pointed out our inner line leading to consolidation is sound and our leadership must not be disturbed. Both argued our present inner and outer line correct and that our party is on right road and must be allowed to continue without interference. Bittelman's motion for letter unanimously rejected on motion of Stalin.

"LOVESTONE."

Mr. GITLOW. Here we have cables from the C. I. and the minutes of the secretariat in reference to the trade-union delegation that is to visit the Soviet Union.

Here we have four cables from the Communist International and from party members in Moscow on American matters that were handled by the Communist International.

Here are also other cables on all the minutes of the political committee and the secretariat: practically every one of them contains cables dealing with intimate American party matters and decisions of the Communist International in reference to them.

[Copy]

Moscow, October 3, 1926.

RUTHENBERG,

*Secretary, W. O. P. A. T., Chicago, Ill.:*

Because of the differences that exist in the party on the question whether the Central Committee of the party is to be removed from Chicago to New York, the Presidium of the E. C. C. I., although recognizing the weightiness of the arguments that have been brought forward by the majority of the political committee, is of the opinion that such a decision should be made unanimously. If unanimity in this question cannot be reached, then the decision in this question should be left to the next party convention. Paragraph concerning the Presidium leaves the decision of this question to the political committee.

KUUSINEN.

*For Presidium of E. C. C. I.*

Moscow, October 3, 1926.

Last clause of contract must be acted on immediately. Seeming separation of two businesses is only to accomplish purpose without too much mechanics from distance. Contract makers say both businesses must go New York and they expect you to act immediately on last clause, after which other business can be accomplished amicably without stockholders' meet. Only fear is you may not understand this phase of contract and might fail to act promptly, in which case your best partners here say you would deserve to lose business. Good letter from signers of contract promised which will explain weightiness too clearly to permit disagreement. But you cannot await letter, which comes much later. Complete cable us immediately what you doing.

KRUSE.

Moscow, October 4, 1926.

Decision provides full possibilities if energetically handled. Transfer paper at once with three prominent editors. First steps necessary immediately and will lead to accomplish transfer to New York. Cable information quick.

HUNKY.

Moscow, October 11, 1926.

Your failure to answer on moving causes serious embarrassment. If you fail to act promptly it can be due only to misunderstanding of attitude here. Universal opinion here for New York with arguments even stranger than yours. Any immediate transfer of paper and stuff can lead to further steps.

HUNKY.

Mr. GITLOW. For example, you must keep in mind that if the Communist Party of the United States wants to hold a national convention—and that is one of the rules of the Communist International—such a national convention cannot be held until the Communist International gives permission to the party to hold a national convention. In other words, the party is not free to decide itself to hold a convention. It is bound by strict rules and must get permission from the Communist International first before it can hold a convention.

Here I have a cable that was sent by Lovestone from Moscow indicating that Stalin supports his general views on the American party.

The following cablegram has been received from Comrade Lovestone giving the final results of the conference in M.:

"Opposition last attack made in organization department. They met complete defeat. Our reorganization work and results fully endorsed. Favorable resolution accepted directed against slogan 'reorganize the reorganization.' Fiatnitsky declared Browder has basically wrong conception of Communist Party. Rejects opposition charge too big apparatus even proposing extension. Summing up Lovestone's interview with Stalin resulted in complete rejection of opposition viewpoint. There will be no American commission in the Presidium."

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, in all of your meetings of the political party and the small governing and ruling committees of the party, did you always have to take into consideration the attitude and the suggestions, if we may call them that, of the International, before you could arrive at a decision as to what should be done with reference to the American party?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, all communistic leaders are in a very difficult position. Their bodies are in the United States but their minds are in Russia, and unless they know how the winds blow in Russia, their security as leaders is very, very shaky. That is why in the Communist Party we have one person assigned to the special task of reading the Russian press, and he reads it with a microscope. Every word is analyzed in order to find out just how the Russian leaders think about things. So that they make no mistakes in being up to the line in support of the Russian policies; and the one who is assigned, in the American party, and who still holds that position in the American party of reading the Russia press, is Alexander Bittelman, who is today a member of the political committee of the American Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, Mr. Gitlow, if the American party should make some decision, even on a minor problem, that was not entirely in accord with the Moscow ideas on that subject, their official positions would be jeopardized very seriously.

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, yes; surely. They could not hold their official positions. Once you make a mistake and misjudge the Russian leaders, that is just too bad for you. Of course, they cannot purge you in the United States, but they can do a number of things. And I will deal with those later on—which are quite serious.

I want to mention another cable. I went to Moscow in 1927. That was my first trip to Moscow. In fact, of the important Communist leaders, I was the one who went to Moscow the latest, because all the others had been there on many occasions before. Responsible for that was the fact that I went into prison, stayed there for about 3 years, then went out on appeal, went back again, lost the appeal, and was pardoned. That took up a number of years, and I could not go to Moscow. But I went to Moscow and was ordered to come to Moscow by cable which was sent to the American party. Foster objected to my going to Moscow. He said my activities in the trade-union field were of such great importance, that if I left for Moscow it would disrupt all those activities.

Nevertheless, a categoric cable came from Moscow signed by Bukharin, who was chairman of the Communist International at the time, saying that in the circumstances, and nothing to the contrary, Ben Gitlow must forthwith come to Moscow and appear before the Executive Committee of the Communist International. And when that cable was received I went to Moscow.

Now, I want to deal with this control of the Communist International, not on hearsay, but on very definite proof. For example, while we are at it, I have here a membership card of the Workers Communist Party of America, American section of the Communist International.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is your own card or someone else's?

Mr. GITLOW. That happens to be my wife's card, when she was for a time a member of the Communist Party. I have my own card here somewhere and will check up on it later.

June 21, 1929, when I sharply disagreed with Stalin's methods in the American party, I received the following letter from Robert Minor. And this is the beginning of the period that brings Browder into control of the American Communist Party. He writes as follows:

Telephone: Harlem 1278-9

Official organ: Daily Worker

COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

SECTION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Workers of the World Unite!

NATIONAL OFFICE,

43 East 125th St., New York City, June 21, 1929.

DEAR COMRADE GITLOW: By action of the political committee of June 19, 1929, you are herewith instructed immediately to make a written statement to the political committee of the party through the secretariat before the question of your future work in the party is settled. In this statement you must make clear the following points:

1. To declare that you accept without reserve and recognize the complete correctness of the Comintern address and the other Comintern decisions on the American question.
2. To declare that you will carry out the address and the decisions, and defend the political correctness of the address and the decisions before the party.
3. To declare that you will support and defend the present leadership of the Communist Party of the United States of America in its work of carrying out the Comintern line and in its fight against all forms of open or concealed

opposition to the Communist International and to the leadership of the American party.

4. To declare that you denounce and emphatically condemn the anti-Comintern conduct of the majority of the delegation of the Communist Party of the United States of America in Moscow in reference to the position there taken toward the Comintern address, the nonsubmission to the Communist International decisions, and attempts to organize anti-Comintern opposition in the Communist Party of the United States of America.

The political committee at the above-mentioned meeting of June 19 decided to instruct you to make a written statement as above described within 48 hours after receipt of these instructions, to be delivered into the hands of the secretariat by the end of the 48-hour period.

Fraternally yours,

RM-MB.

SECRETARIAT.  
By (Signed) ROBERT MINOR,  
*For Executive Department.*

This letter, which was dated on June 21, and to which I had to have an answer in the office of the party on June 23, I received on June 25, and I was expelled without even having been given an opportunity to reply to the letter.

But this letter is a very important document, in my opinion, and gives you an insight into the message of the Communist movement and gives you some understanding of the methods which Joseph Stalin uses.

The executive committee of the American Communist Party wanted me to sign a document, which if I signed, was a confession that I was against the Comintern, against the American Communist Party, and that I was guilty of the crimes which were charged against me by the Comintern, by direction of the Communist International, and by the unlimited campaign which they conducted against me after I disagreed with Stalin, and that is precisely what you have in Russia at the present time.

A Russian party member who comes into some disagreement, who speaks or comes into some disagreement with the power of Stalin is forced, upon pain of Communist Party discipline, to sign letters of this kind charging even worse crimes, and this is the basis of the whole confession method which is used against the members of the party themselves, and forms the basis for the whole frame-up of the International Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to have all of these original documents returned to you?

Mr. GITLOW. I would like to have them.

The CHAIRMAN. I think these important documents, Mr. Whitley, ought to be photostated, if future action is taken against the Communist Party, as I am of the opinion ought to be done, and the Government would need these documents in presenting its case, so I would suggest that as a matter of precaution you have the Library of Congress make photostat copies of these important documents showing the control by the Comintern of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, I expect to do that, and also to have reproductions placed in the printed report of these hearings, which will appear in the back of the hearings as an appendix.

The CHAIRMAN. And in like manner the agents of the Department of Justice, as we have already given them some information, should have copies.

Mr. WHITLEY. I will do that, too.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now after 12, and we will take a recess until 1:15.

(At 12:03 p. m. a recess was taken until 1:15 p. m. of the same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

The committee met, pursuant to taking of a recess, at 1:15 p. m.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order, please.

#### TESTIMONY OF BENJAMIN GITLOW—Resumed

Mr. Gitlow, may I ask you a question?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In investigating the Nazi group and organizations in the United States and in listening to their testimony and reading the pamphlets and literature it is very apparent that one of the chief arguments they use to gain force in the United States is communism and Judaism are synonymous; that the Jews in the United States are the Communists, and they have circulated it so extensively all over the United States that many people—I will not say many—but too many people, I will say, have come to believe that is absolutely true. It is only because of that fact that I am going to ask you this question, as I asked it of Mr. Browder, and the question is this: You have been in the movement for many years. You are a Jew, are you not?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You are here rendering a great service in exposing communism for whatever it is to the people who have been charging that Jews are responsible for communism, and the further question I want to ask you is this: What proportion of the membership of the Communist Party, as you have known it, was Jewish, and what proportion was non-Jewish? In other words, may I put it this way. Is the proportion of Jews in the Communist Party any greater than the proportion of Jews to the entire population of the country?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I think it might run about the same, but I don't think it ever exceeded about 15 or 20 percent of the party membership; and the Communist Party was divided into national groups; the foreign national group who happen to live in the United States—some were citizens and some were not.

The leading influence in the Communist Party was in the hands, the leaders here of the American members of the Communist Party, the outstanding leaders of the Communist Party. Men who were born in this country, like Amiter, myself, William Z. Foster, Clarence Hathaway; all of them are American citizens and were born in the United States, and the majority of them are not Jews.

The CHAIRMAN. The majority of the leaders are not Jews?

Mr. GITLOW. No; and then if you will examine the complexion of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which controls the International—

The CHAIRMAN. Will you speak loud enough for all of us to hear?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. If you will examine the complexion of the members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union you will see that the Jewish members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union make up a fraction only of the entire membership, and the leadership of the party is in the hands of non-Jews.

Joseph Stalin is not a Jew, Lenin was not a Jew, and the chiefs of the country are not Jews. The Jews play a minor role in the higher positions; some Jews are in high positions, but in the main the leadership is dominated—leading positions are held—by Gentile members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The charge that has been hurled against the Jews of the United States in order to develop a movement of intolerance in this country has absolutely no basis in fact; in fact, it is one of the fake fights in this situation.

On the one hand we have the fake fight of the Communists in favor of democracy, led by Earl Browder, which he does not believe.

On the other hand, we have the fake fight against communism led by Fritz Kuhn, William Pelley, and the other groups in the country.

However, the activities of these groups in their fake fight against communism, Fritz Kuhn, Pelley, and the rest of them, give ammunition to Earl Browder to come out as a defender of democracy, for tolerance and liberal institutions.

But that becomes a difficult job on his part, because Stalin is now taking in Hitler as one of his bosom friends; it is quite difficult for him to make his fight as a man who is fighting with the Communist Party when Stalin has taken in the Nazis.

And I think we will be rendering the people of the United States and the country as a whole a great service if we can show, through the activities of this committee, that the Jews as a whole in this country are first of all a loyal body of American citizens who believe in the institutions of this country and certainly in the democratic liberties which we all enjoy, and if we can put the Fritz Kuhns, the Earl Browders, the Pelleys, and the Campbells where they belong, then we can kill for all time this attempt to bring into the United States a situation where intolerance will prevail and where the Bill of Rights would be a scrap of paper instead of the genuine article that it is today.

For that reason I believe everything must be done to clear up the situation so that we can meet on the basis of man to man and not on the basis of prejudice.

**The CHAIRMAN.** In other words, it would be correct to say that the Communists are masquerading under the name of liberalism.

**Mr. GITLOW.** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN.** And identifying themselves with the liberal forces, such as democratic groups.

On the other hand, the Nazi groups are masquerading under the name of patriotism.

**Mr. GITLOW.** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Seeking to convince other people that they are patriotic.

**Mr. GITLOW.** I think that is correct, and we can go even further. The Communists have been parading as defenders of liberty in America, while the philosophy is the very antithesis of liberty, because if the Communist philosophy should prevail, liberalism in the United States would be a thing of the past.

And the Nazis have been parading as patriots of the United States, but what the American flag stands for and what the Constitution stands for, and the Declaration of Independence stands for, would

mean absolutely nothing if the Nazis, the Fritz Kuhns, or the Pelleys themselves gained power in America; they would give the Nazis the leadership.

It is interesting to note that when the Bund holds a meeting they parade with the American flag in the interest of the Nazi Government of Germany.

The Communists also parade with the American flag as the champions of the Soviet Government of Russia.

In this they have one thing in common, to masquerade as patriots of the United States, when their main objective, both of them, is to undermine the very institutions which make for American democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is a very excellent statement, one which if it could get out in the country, will result in these organizations and individuals recognizing communism for what it is, and result in having people who joined those movements in recognizing it for what it is.

If that could be brought out then America would have an end of this thing provided these organizations, the Nazis, the Communists, and the rest of them are prosecuted under the law as they ought to be without further delay.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were discussing the relationship between the Communist International and the Communist Party in the United States and the other countries of the world.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you continue your discussion along that line?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I was presenting some material and some documents and minutes to prove that contention.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. Will you continue?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes: I propose to continue along that line.

I stated that the Communists look upon the Soviet Union as the fatherland. In other words, that the world is divided by the simple demarcation, that on the one side, you have the bourgeoisie, the capitalists; and on the other hand you have the working classes, and the poor farmers, as such.

They take the position that this simple demarcation in the world's population is the natural boundary line to consider. That on the other hand, you have these enemies for what they stand for; and on the other hand you have the section where you have to organize for the friends.

They have reached the conclusion that the Soviet Union, in their opinion, is the government of the working classes, of the farmers and the peasants, and the fatherland of the workers and the farmers; and all on the other side are enemies of that fatherland and patriotism is to be measured by that demarcation that ignores all national boundaries.

So, they have adopted, in 1927, when I was in Moscow, because they expected in a few years that the Soviet Union would be involved in a war, the slogan of the workers fatherland; and I have here a communication which was sent out to all shop committees, trade unions, and other labor organizations and to all the workers of Detroit, by the committee in Detroit of the unemployed council,

which at that time was affiliated with the Trade Union Unit League, and the Auto Workers Union and with headquarters at 3782 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

And, this communication was signed by George E. Powers, secretary of the T. U. U. L., who is a member of the Communist Party; and Philip A. Raymond, secretary of auto workers union, also a member of the Communist Party.

**PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE OF  
DETROIT UNEMPLOYED COUNCIL,  
AFFILIATED WITH TRADE UNION UNITY  
LEAGUE AND AUTO WORKERS UNION,  
Detroit, Mich., December 14, 1929.**

*To All Shop Committees, Trade-Unions, and Other Labor Organizations:  
To All Workers of Detroit:*

Today we are faced in this city with the most serious unemployment situation, which already has brought misery and starvation to tens of thousands of families. This is not only a local problem. Unemployment is reaching into millions throughout the country. Capitalism produces unemployment and crisis, and the mad speed-up that the workers were subjected to in the recent period has only aggravated this situation. The workers were called up to produce ever-larger quantities of goods in a shorter period of time and at lower wages. Unemployment is not due to the workers not being in need of food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities. On the contrary, the workers were never in need more than now. But the capitalists are not interested in the need of the workers. All they are interested in is increased profits.

The remedy that the bosses have for the present unemployment and economic crisis is a further campaign of wage cutting, an intensification of the speed-up. This is the program worked out by big business at the Hoover conference, endorsed by President Green of the American Federation of Labor. This is the program that Mayor Lodge and Martel of the Detroit Federation of Labor are proposing. The Ford fake "wage raise" is part of this campaign to lower the living standards of the workers.

Every act of resistance on the part of the workers is being met by the most brutal attack against them. This we saw in Gastonia, New Orleans, Marion, and we see it in the present strike of the Illinois miners under the leadership of the National Miners Union.

The capitalists are driving toward a new world imperialist war, for the redivision of the world markets. But all the capitalist countries under the leadership of the United States are preparing to attack the Soviet Union in order to convert the rich territory of Russia into a colony for their plunders. They fear that the Soviet Union, where the workers having abolished capitalism are enjoying an ever-increasing standard of living, are abolishing forever unemployment, is becoming the inspiration of the workers of this country.

We must not be fooled by the bosses' promises, by their fake plans of public works. We can expect nothing from the capitalists, their community fund, and their other agencies. Only the organization of the unemployed into a powerful organization united in common struggle with these employed can force the capitalists to consider the needs of the workers. This struggle must unite all workers organized and unorganized, employed and unemployed, white and Negro, young workers, and women workers.

We must organize and fight for—

1. Work or wages. Unemployed relief to be paid for by the employers and their Government, and administered by the workers' organizations. No payment or rent while unemployed.
  2. Fight against speed-up, wage cuts, and for the 7-hour day.
  3. Organize the unorganized. Form shop committees in the factories.
  4. Organize. Unite all workers in the militant trade unions of the Trade Union Unity League.
  5. Fight against the A. F. of L. which is the agent of the bosses.
  6. Fight against imperialist war and war preparation.
  7. Defend the Soviet Union—the workers' fatherland.
- On the basis of the above program, we call upon all workers in the trade-unions, shop committees in the plants, and all other labor organizations to send three (3) delegates to the conference for the organization of an unemployed

council, to be held on Friday, January 17, at 7:30 p. m. at the Trade Union Center, 3782 Woodware Avenue, near Seldon.

Fraternally yours,

(Signed) GEORGE E. POWERS,

*Secretary of T. U. U. L.*

(Signed) PHILIP T. RAYMOND,

*Secretary of Auto Workers Union.*

(Signed) ALFRED E. GOETZ,

*Secretary of Provisional Committee.*

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Raymond is still active, or was recently with the automobile workers?

We had a man by that name before us.

Mr. GITLOW. That probably is the same Raymond. This is Philip Raymond.

The CHAIRMAN. There were two of them, were there not, two brothers?

Mr. GITLOW. I only know of one, Philip A. Raymond.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, proceed.

Mr. GITLOW. And in this communication they use this slogan, and the slogan is to defend the Soviet Union, the workers' fatherland.

Now, I have here also—

The CHAIRMAN. While you are on that point, if it does not interrupt your chain of thought, I would like to have you explain, and I think it would be of great interest—at least it would be to me—why these people, liberal-minded, at least, who call themselves liberal-minded and probably are sincere and who have a certain philosophy about government, have allowed themselves to be duped by Communist agents.

By what process has that been accomplished?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I think, in the liberal field you have the same situation that prevails in the usual reactionary field. In other words, nothing succeeds like success.

So when Hitler took over power in Germany with his proletariat ideas, his race ideas, and his ideas of anti-Semitism, and was able to recall great victories for the Nazi Government, victories against such powerful governments like England and France and the rest of the world, that was a source of great inspiration to the extreme proletariat and reactionaries in the United States and to certain others who called themselves liberals. They were greatly impressed by the so-called successes also of Stalin in his 5-year plan, and they were greatly impressed by the weight of the propaganda which was made for the success of the Soviet Union and for the liberal achievements of the Soviet Union.

In other words, keep in mind that the Bolsheviks have been great believers in the importance of propaganda. In fact Hitler himself has learned a great deal about the effectiveness and importance of propaganda from the Bolsheviks, and the Soviet Union has been untiring in spreading its propaganda in the United States, propaganda which portrays the Soviet Union as a paradise compared with the rest of the world.

At the time when the rest of the world was facing a crash, an economic crisis, with a great many unemployed, it told of the Soviet Union being built up until they were achieving the 5-year plan in 4 years; that they got rid of their unemployed; that they were increas-

ing wages, reducing hours, privileges which the workers did not enjoy in other countries; all of this propaganda was being given out and it made a great and lasting impression upon the liberals. And they thought that if capitalism has failed that at least they could see that socialism was being successfully prosecuted in Russia and perhaps pointed the way out of the present dilemma brought about by the economic crisis.

At the same time the Soviet Union was not slow in attaching to itself the propaganda, largely of the liberals who were impressed, and in taking up the fight for liberal ideas they forgot about the proletariat, to distinguish between championing the ideas of liberty, like representative government against fascism, and they also forgot at the same time the outstanding totalitarian regime in the world was the Soviet Union.

They even forgot to say that if, as liberals they had a disagreement with the Soviet Union or with the Bolshevik leaders, they would be subjected to such attacks as had been made on the Jews by such organizations as the bund, the Fritz Kuhns, and the Pelleys, through the method of personal vituperation.

On the other hand, this mass of propaganda and this threat of personal destruction had a lot to do in placing liberals in the position in which they now find themselves. And I think the greatest service that can be rendered to American liberty is to divorce themselves both from this movement and from the propaganda which does not give the real facts on the Soviet Union at all, and from the threat of communism which does not mean liberty in America at all.

Mr. MASON. Do you not feel that one of the greatest pieces of propaganda, and the most successful, perhaps, of the Soviet Government's propaganda in the United States during the last 30 or 50 years is the exhibit at the World's Fair?

Mr. GITLOW. I have not seen the World's Fair.

Mr. MASON. The exhibit of the Soviet Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is a statement that is most elucidating showing to what extent the efforts and investigations of communism was resented throughout the United States. It has always been to me a matter of confusion, at least, and I have never had it explained to me why it was that our efforts to expose the philosophy of communism, with its far-reaching consequences, was resented.

I am glad you have made the explanation to show to what extent they have gone. And now, in that connection, is it not true that that is one of the tactics, the routes followed is by ridicule? For instance, when Dr. Matthews testified in the beginning that certain people were being duped, were being taken in, with their positions shown on letterheads, I know people right in this room who laughed at him and thought it was a big joke, and it was hailed and ridiculed by a great many people.

As a matter of fact, that is one of the chief tactics which they use, is it not?

Mr. GITLOW. It is one of their main tactics.

The CHAIRMAN. They have learned to use the power of ridicule.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; and they have also learned that if you repeat a lie long enough it may be accepted as the truth.

Mr. THOMAS. Right along that same line, as you probably know, there have been three congressional committees such as this. The first

committee was ridiculed from one end of the land to the other as being a "red" baiter.

Is that not one of the pet phrases of the Communists which they use against such committees?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; it is one of their phrases, "red baiter," or anti-labor, even before you get started.

Mr. THOMAS. I could not help but think about it while you were testifying and I am amazed to think that you would feel free to come to a committee like this and talk as freely as you have. I am just wondering if, as a result of these discussions you have not received threats upon yourself within the last few days.

Mr. GITLOW. No; I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us proceed.

Mr. STARNES. You say that is undoubtedly one of the reasons why a lot of genuine, sincere people, who list themselves as progressives in this country were so bitter in the denunciation of this country was they considered dominance of the Communist Party was in the hand of the Jewish leaders.

Mr. GITLOW. I think so; to a very large extent that is a fact. Although some members in my judgment have genuine convictions.

Mr. STARNES. I understand.

Mr. GITLOW. In my judgment they have.

Mr. STARNES. But that has been the method used to kill the effectiveness of this committee and is to absolutely make it take a run-out.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Whitley.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you proceed with your documentary introduction?

Mr. GITLOW. I just want to cover very quickly, if I may, all these documents because I think they are instructive.

I have here the Party Organizer. This is the magazine which the party published in 1927 and which went only to party members; it had no outside sale.

In this we find in the issue of December 1927, we have a letter from the organization department of the executives of the Communist International instructing the American party as to publishing factory papers in the various plants and factories in the United States.

*To the Central Committee of the Workers Party of America, Organization Department, New York.*

DEAR COMRADES: We were very interested in the factory newspapers you sent us recently. The articles in the Daily Worker dealing with this question have also come to our notice, but we are rather disturbed at the statement in Comrade Lovestone's report that at present fewer factory newspapers are being published. We are alarmed because factory newspapers in American conditions are essentially important. Factory newspapers can only be effective when their development is systematically supported by the party.

We are not in possession of the instructions issued by the Central Committee on this question recently, but insofar the articles in the press are concerned, we must say that they have not been concrete enough. Experiences and examples, which you must have had in your possession, have not been utilized in a sufficiently instructive manner to illustrate the situation.

The task before the American party today not only consists in enlarging the network of factory newspapers (which is extremely important) but in the maintenance of the existing newspapers and their improvement. In reference to this last point, we must point out that factory newspapers which we received recently err on the side of lack of initiative, their approach to the masses is

inadequate, and they do not react to their wishes and discontent by proposing definite demands. The Harvester Worker of the McCormick factory should serve as an example of what other factory newspapers ought to be.

Despite the large percentage of foreign workers, the nuclei of the Workers Party of America seem disinclined to issue notices in the language of the foreigners who are working in the given factory. We should like to point out here that the Communist Party of Argentine publishes notices and short articles in Italian, Hungarian, and Czech languages, etc., in the factory newspapers. This custom has given very good results and should serve as an example for the Workers Party of America.

Factory newspapers should inform the workers in simple language about the activities of American imperialism in Latin America and China. Some of the newspapers have already begun to do so. It is important, however, that the party committees everywhere should draw attention to this question and point out its importance. The party should also control in how far factory newspapers deviate from Communist ideology, a danger which is especially possible in newly created factory newspapers.

In conclusion, we ask you to keep us informed continuously about the number of factory newspapers, their circulation, and how often they are published.

With Communist greetings,

(Signature) \_\_\_\_\_,

(pp.) Chief of the Organization Department of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

I have here a document that was issued on the reorganization of the Workers Party. This was in June 1925. The Communist International as early as then stated to all Communist parties that they must bolshevize themselves, must be a Bolshevik party, and they called upon them to campaign to bolshevize all the Communist parties of the Communist International.

This [indicating] was a letter sent to the party organizers and units and leaders.

A letter to the Central Executive Committee from the Communist International on the reorganization of the party so that it should become really a Bolshevik party.

LETTER FROM COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL TO THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE WORKERS (COMMUNIST) PARTY OF AMERICA

DEAR COMRADES: During the visit of the representatives of your party to Moscow we held with them a consultation on the immediate tasks of the Workers Party in the sphere of organization and the methods of carrying out the decision of the plenum as expressed in the theses of Comrade Zinoviev on bolshevization in the section dealing with the duties of the Workers Party, the second point of which (the decision) states that it is necessary "to fuse the national sections of the party into a real united party." The conclusion arrived at in our consultations on this question was unanimously agreed to by all present.

We observe with great satisfaction that the Workers Party has recently been achieving undoubted successes in its political activities. Nevertheless, it may be safely said that these successes would have been greater if the Workers Party possessed a proper organizational structure. Every member of the Workers Party is aware that there is no party or political organization in the United States, apart from the Workers Party, which really stands for and endeavors to defend the interests of all toilers. Nevertheless, every member of the Workers Party will admit that this party—the only party of the workers and farmers—is still far from having received from the majority of the workers, the interests of whom it is out to defend, that recognition which the party should and can win. It is obvious to every comrade how much stronger would be the position of the American workers and farmers if they followed the Workers Party and if the influence of the latter were the dominating factor in the movement of the masses. Therefore, every member of the Workers Party should ask himself the question, What in reality is preventing his party from gaining that influence?

Provided the policy of the party is a correct one it may be safely said that one of the chief reasons for such a state of affairs lies in the defects of the organiza-

tional structure of the Workers Party, which are greater than in any other party and therefore affect it to a greater extent than other parties. It cannot be denied that it will be extremely difficult for the party to consolidate its successes, and that the extension and interpretation of its political influence will be hampered very considerably both in respect of embracing by our agitation the wide sections of the workers and farmers who are still outside our influence and by winning over those workers from other mass organizations which our enemies still hold firmly in their grasp, as well as in the protection of our movement from possible destruction by the bourgeoisie, if our party does not possess a well-constructed organization. This consideration, in our opinion, places before the Workers Party with greater insistence than ever before the question of a correct organizational structure.

For a party of the working class a proper structure is first and foremost a guaranty that its decision will be carried into effect by all its organs and members.

What importance can a party have, what part can it play in the political life of the country, if its decisions remain only on paper, are not carried into effect, and assert no influence on real affairs? The party must know how to act, counting upon the whole of its membership and the help of its organs. For that purpose its organization must be a united and centralized one. If its organs and members act in an isolated way, each after its own fashion, it is hopeless to expect useful and desirable results. Moreover, the party must be able to bring the masses into the movement, which demands that its structure should be such that its organs can penetrate deeply into the nonparty mass of the workers, exert influence over them, organize them for the struggle, guide their organizations, and also introduce the decisions and slogans of the party into those organizations.

The present organizational structure of the Workers Party is not adapted to these requirements. Those advantages which centralized activity bring a working-class party are absent in the Workers Party. It does not even possess a real single guiding party center capable of directing the activities of the party as a whole, nor does unity prevail in its ranks. A party of the working class can, if it has a centralized party organization, simultaneously lay duties upon the whole party and direct the whole of its forces toward putting them into effect. The result is a situation in which the party is able to carry out its policy firmly, uniformly, and without distortion in all parts of the country and in all organizations in which the party has its members, and, in fact, everywhere where the members of the party come into contact with the nonparty workers and peasants. The Federal structure of the Workers Party stands in the way of such a successful conduct of its work. Each of its 17 national sections represents almost a separate and independent party within the Workers Party, enjoying a large portion of independence in relation to the leading organ, the central committee. The national sections have their own district, town, and national bureaus; they summon their own conferences and collect their own membership contributions. The fundamental organizational requirement of a party defending the interests of the whole working class, namely, that the decisions of the leading party organs should be carried out by all the party organizations, is to a large extent dependent in the Workers Party on whether the national organizations are willing or not to carry out the corresponding decisions of the superior party bodies. Therefore, unlike a centralized party, the Workers Party, as it is at present constituted, is not a party of united action. The party members of the various national sections are not fused together into one whole, but divided among themselves. They do not discuss questions interesting all the workers and the whole party. They live the exclusive life of their own national minority, or of its working-class section, so isolated from the American workers that they even do not sufficiently know the direct interests of the whole working class of the United States. As a result, instead of unity of action, instead of general decisions which would unite and consolidate the party, disorganization and differences inevitably arise in the course of its work.

Of course, we do not for a moment believe that this state of affairs exists because the various national sections desire it, or that it is not in any way due to objective causes and the past development of the party. It is also clear that the absolutely essential reorganization of the Workers Party, with a view to centralization, cannot be at once accomplished upon the mere orders of the central committee. It is quite natural that in so nationally diversified a party as the American party centralization cannot be as easily achieved as in some

other working-class parties. But the abnormality of the present situation must be made clear to every member of the Workers Party whatever national section he belongs to. It is necessary that every member of the Workers Party fully realize the absolute necessity for centralization, the actual harmfulness of the present divisions in the ranks of the party, and realize the part which national sections ought to play in such a party like the American party. If that is achieved, then whatever the difficulty which the task of the reorganization may encounter, their solution will be possible.

The beginnings of the reorganization above referred to are already to be found in the successes achieved in the work of the existing factory nuclei in the Workers Party. It is essential that the formation of these nuclei should be vigorously proceeded with, a task which according to the Daily Worker has already been well begun. The factory nucleus is the best organizational method of uniting comrades belonging to different nationalities and bringing them into contact with the working-class masses. Therefore, the work of properly organizing the party will be best accomplished by the organization of factory nuclei. The party should also make it its duty to form street nuclei. In these nuclei the national factor will no longer count, too. We will not dwell here on the question as to how the factory and street nuclei should be formed, since that question is dealt with in special instructions and resolutions, from which you may obtain all necessary information. We would only refer to one fact which we learned from the reports in the Daily Worker on the work of the factory nuclei. In these reports the names of active comrades are openly mentioned, and facts are cited which may assist the employers in taking repressive measures against the members of the nuclei. We desire to draw your attention to the fact that a nucleus, without isolating itself from the nonparty workers and clerical employees ought so to conduct its work as not to permit the employer or his agents to see how the nucleus is working or to ascertain who its members are. The activities of a nucleus must be concealed from the eyes of the enemy and yet keep close to the working class masses. (See our letters of December 6, 1923, No. 1313, and January 10, 1925, No. 490 on this subject.)

Another essential step in the reorganization of the party should be the creation of united party committees in all towns and urban districts, which would unite under their leadership all the members of the party residing in the given town or town district, independent of nationality. The town and town district committees which according to your delegation, exist in New York and its districts, cannot meet the demands of a centralized party, since they, in fact, do not guide the party work; the work is not carried out in the various national groups according to the instructions of the New York town or district committees. But the situation is still worse in other towns where there are not town district committees, and where there is no sign of united party work, since if the national groups receive its instructions at all regarding party work, it is only from the bureaus of their own national section.

While devoting every possible attention to the creation of nuclei, the party must also make it its aim to set up district and town party committees. In the town district—into which the large town must be divided, if that has not already been done—meetings must be summoned of all the members of the nuclei already formed and from all the national groups still existing in the given town district. If the number of members in such a district is too large to make it feasible to summon a general meeting, a town district conference may be summoned instead consisting of delegates from all the nuclei and the still existing national and other groups of the given district. At the district meeting, or conference, a single town district committee for all the national groups or nuclei should be elected to carry out all the work of the district. Town committees should be elected in a similar way in small towns, where it is not advisable to mark off town district. In very large towns, such as New York, Boston, Chicago, etc., the town committee should be elected at the conference of town district delegates elected at the district meetings or conference.

Some remark should be made concerning the election of town district committees and the town committees in small towns.

We must make one very important observation regarding the composition of town district and town committees. They must not be Federal bodies, or, so to speak, coordinating elements under the control of one member who regards himself as the representative of "his" national group and believes his tasks to be to defend the interests of "his own" national organization. Therefore, during the preparations for summoning and conducting the electoral meeting (or conference) it must be clearly emphasized that at the meeting the participants must regard themselves as members of a united party and not as representatives

of national sections, and that questions, even those which concern their sections, can only, and will only, be considered from the point of view of the whole party. Similarly, the lists of candidates for the district and town committees must not be drawn up on the principle of proportional national representation. In the election to the committee, one must consider the capacity of the comrades elected to guide the party organization, and the candidates must therefore be put forward only on individual considerations. Nevertheless, the candidates should be selected from all the large national sections, so that the future committee should be guaranteed contact with them. This remark applies also to the elections to the Central Committee.

It is equally important for the rule to be adopted that where factory nuclei already exist their representatives should unconditionally be elected to the party committees, and in numbers guaranteeing the influence of the factory nuclei in the affairs and work of the given party organization. If the factory nuclei are already sufficiently numerous, their representatives must be given the majority of the party committees.

#### LANGUAGE FRACTIONS

Thirdly, it is equally important to bear in mind the necessity of arranging the general meetings of the nuclei, the party meetings, the conferences and the meetings of the party organs (committees, etc.) in such a way that the comrades belonging to the various national groups should be able to take part in the meetings, themselves speaking and understanding everything that is said—in a word that they should feel no inconvenience from the fact that they know no language but their own. To that end it is essential that at all meetings where comrades from different national groups attend there should be translators, they should be so organized as to hamper the proceedings of the meeting as little as possible.

One more remark regarding the size of the town districts. In certain towns the town districts are inordinately large, both as regards territory and the number of inhabitants. For instance, in New York, Brooklyn, which has a population of 2,000,000, is regarded as a single town district. Of course, it is impossible to cover and be of service to Brooklyn without dividing it up. In determining the size of districts the possibilities of helping them must be borne in mind. It should also be borne in mind that the town districts must coincide with the municipality, or unite within their territory several municipalities wards, without breaking them up.

When the Workers Party in the towns adopts the system of town district and town party committees common to all nationalities it will already be possible to some extent to carry into effect the decisions of the leading party centers throughout the whole organization, from top to bottom and to carry them into the factories, workshops, and other undertakings. The question of district committees and organizations will then be solved with less difficulty.

The election of town district and town committees—which can be proceeded with even before nuclei have been formed in the majority of the factories—is, after the formation of nuclei, the second radical step toward the reformation of the Federal-national organization of the Workers Party. With the growth of the nuclei the national organizations will cease to be the fundamental part of party structure, and will begin to play a different role.

One has to grasp the new role of national sections in order to understand that a correct reorganization of the party will only help to strengthen the work among the proletariat of each individual nationality. Even before now, the national sections of the Workers Party have to a certain extent exercised some influence upon the public opinion of the workers of their nationality, since it was they chiefly who were the active workers, in all the, sometimes fairly numerous, educational, social, and other working-class institutions in their language (such as, for instance, the People's Houses of the Finns). Moreover, the national sections actually control their point of view of general party interests. For instance, a party policy was not always pursued, since the national sections, owing to the fact that they are separated from general party life and the inadequate (and sometimes distorted) understanding of general party duties which resulted could not always be fully acquainted with the forms of agitation and propaganda corresponding with the aims of the party in each given period. Moreover, this work could not be sufficiently intensive, since its nature was dictated by local interests and did not embrace the interests and aims of the struggle of the whole working class of the United States. Only by bringing the national

sections together and fusing them will it be possible to extend and intensify their activity.

The existing national sections, or federations must not lose their mass character. On the contrary, they must attract all the workers and clerical employees of their nationality who accept the view of the class struggle.

The existing national federations by their agitation and propaganda work in the working class bodies, and organizations of their particular nationality must win the workers belonging to the national minorities of America away from the influence of the social democrats, the nationalists, the clericals, and other bourgeois tendencies. The national federations must be a reservoir drawing the best elements into the Workers Party and the workers and clerical employees of their particular nationality into the American trade-unions. The national federations must not isolate themselves from one another, but on the contrary, set up closer contact, not only among themselves, but also with the American workers belonging to their trade-unions, and interest themselves generally more than hitherto in American life.

It will, of course, be understood that the national sections in the form above indicated cannot enter the Workers Party as a whole. The party members belonging to the present national sections must join the party nuclei of the factories where they work, or, if they do not work in enterprises, the nuclei of the streets in which they reside.

It is there that they must pay their party dues. Thus the national sections will not form parts of the Workers Party. The members of the present national sections will enter the party through the nuclei.

All members of the Workers Party, Finns, Germans, Russians, etc., must set up party fractions within their wide national sections, which will elect their town district, town regional, State, and National leading organs (bureaus). But— \* \* \* \* The national fraction bureaus must abandon their isolation and become bodies for adapting the party members of their nationalities to general party life. Hence in the work of reorganization the duty arises of bringing the national fraction bureaus close to the general guiding organs of the party, identifying them with the general party machine, thus enabling them to strengthen and improve the quality of their work.

That is why such a structure must be created for the agitational and propaganda party committees. In order to guide the work in the agitational and propaganda departments of the party committees the national fraction bureaus should be included in full force, or where this is not required, in part, so that they may be able to conduct the work among their nationals in their own language. The leadership, responsibility, and control of their activities lie with the Agitprop department and the correspondent party committee as a whole.

It will therefore be seen that the national bureau fractions will be by no means limited to the extent of their activities, but, on the other hand, they will be included in the system of a united party machine and their functions will be different from what they have been hitherto. While the national bureaus hitherto were independent leading party bodies representing the national sections in the party, and had the right of directing the whole work of the national section without exception and to collect membership dues, they will now lose those functions but, on the other hand, will become a part of the general party apparatus, working under its control and direction and according to its directions and performing the whole of the agitational and propaganda work among their own nationalities.

The Central Committee should see that statutes be drawn up regulating the work of the fraction bureaus of the national sections in their new form. These statutes should provide for the ratification by the Agitprop departments of the party committees of the decisions of the national fraction bureaus, the summoning of national conferences with the agreement of the competent party committee, etc.

Within a town district the comrades belonging to one nationality and using one language avail themselves of the Agitprop department of the town district committee (that is, the competent national bureau) for agitational and propaganda work among the workers of their nationality within the town district, within the working class organizations, etc. The most capable comrades should be entrusted with responsible work—reports, lectures, and other forms of propaganda and agitational work among the workers of their nationality in their native tongue. Comrades speaking the same language may and should be assembled within the limits of a town district, in order to listen to reports and to take part in theoretical discussions, in order to raise the level of party education

and to determine the methods of agitational, propaganda, party educational, and club work. These meetings have no right to adopt decisions on party questions—questions of policy or internal party questions, etc. This right belongs to the factory nuclei, the street nuclei, and the locals (where they still exist), the general meeting of the party members or the party conference which are to be the party organizations of the urban district or town, since for the party there can be no difference of interests demanding discussion or decision by a national section alone. The work of the Agitprop departments of the town district committees, as all the activities of the latter are directed by the town committee, which also has its Agitprop department, which in its turn includes the national fraction bureaus, whose function it is to control the agitational propaganda work among their own nationalities. Similar bureaus must be formed in the superior party committee (Regional and Central Committee).

Within the nonparty working-class organizations and instances of the various nationalities—Finns, Poles, Jews, etc.—such as cooperatives, people's houses, mutual-aid societies, etc., the duty of the party members of the corresponding nationality is that of a party fraction with the same functions as the party fractions within the trade unions have or should have (see our instructions of February 1924, on fractional work and the corresponding section of the thesis on party structure adopted by the organizational conference). In these national nonparty organizations—such as cooperatives, mutual-aid societies, clubs, people's houses, or printing, publishing, newspaper, and similar limited-liability companies—the comrades come into direct contact with wide sections of workers, clerks, or farmers of their own nationality and speaking in their own tongue. Consequently, the influence of the party will, to a large extent, be exercised through the national fractions in the above-mentioned organizations, and the work and policy which the national sections of the Workers Party are carrying on at present, as well as the agitational and propaganda work among the working-class masses of their own nationality, will be carried on inside of the national fractions in close contact with the corresponding party committees. While the agitational and propaganda work will be conducted by the reformed national bureaus, included in the apparatus of the Agitprop departments, the work of the fractions in the cooperatives, publishing houses, banks, etc., will be directed by other corresponding departments of the party committees, trade-union, organizational, etc. It is, therefore, necessary to organize such national Communist fractions in all nonparty organizations, Latvian, Lithuanian, Jewish, Polish, etc., both town district, town, regional district, and national. The national fractions in all the above-mentioned organizations—workers' clubs, workers' insurance societies, sport societies, etc.—will carry out the policy of the Communist Party, raise questions for discussion and bring forward proposals corresponding with the general tactics of the party, or upon the special decision of party bodies, will carry on agitation on the instructions of the Workers Party, explain the activities of the fraction among the nonparty working-class members of the organizations, etc.

At the head of the national Communist fractions of the local, district, and central national bodies of the organizations there should be bureaus for guiding the fractional work. Their activities as we have said, will be guided and controlled by the competent party committees—town district, town, etc.

It should also be provided that the bureaus of all fractions of similar institutions of one nationality, for instance fraction bureaus of Finnish workers' cooperatives, may have a single central bureau uniting the activities of all the local and regional bureaus. Those bureaus in their turn should maintain with the local, regional, and central committees of the party through the corresponding departments of these committees. The latter may also unite the fraction bureaus (cooperatives for instance), of all nationalities, in order to exchange experiences, co-ordinate activities, and even for united action. As in the case of the nuclei, we shall not here give theses regarding the fractions, but would refer you to the instructions which were adopted by the presidium in February 1924 and by the organizational conference in March 1925.

The alteration of the functions of a national organization within the organizational structure of the party, raises the question of party dues. It will, of course, be understood that after reorganization party dues will not go to the national organizations, but to the town committee (through the town district committees), which should retain a certain percentage for its own needs and transfer the remainder to the superior party committee. The question will arise, as to what means the national organizations will conduct their work (agitation, propaganda, education, etc.) The only answer

can be that this work will be financed by the party committees which will assign the necessary funds for this purpose.

The very first steps toward the reorganization of the national sections will come up against the question of the party press. The situation which at present exists in the Workers Party with regard to the party press is entirely abnormal. As a matter of fact, the party and the central committee have no control whatever over the party papers issued by the various national sections in their own languages. The papers of the national sections can write what they like without even following the general policy of the Central Committee and the party. This "freedom" of the press from party control is in full accord with the general independence of the national sections of the party center. This situation must also be changed especially after the election of party committees common for all nationalities. The Central Committee must place the party press in all languages under its control. The Central Committee or some other competent party committee must be in a position to give direct instructions on policy to the editors of all papers which are recognized, or desire to be recognized, by the party as party papers. The party should transmit its instructions on policy to the press through the competent national factions, i. e., through those party members who are shareholders in a national paper, or are on its directing bodies, editorial boards, etc. In this way the Central Committee may, through the corresponding factions, exercise a controlling influence over a paper which is not officially a party paper, introduce desirable comrades on to the editorial boards or have them appointed as editors, etc. Of course, with regard to the papers which belong to the party, the Central Committee must have the unconditional right of directly ratifying the appointment of the editors.

In conclusion, we desire to draw your attention to two important points. First, it is quite clear, as we stated above, that it is no easy matter to reform the old structure of the party immediately. The old organization has become deep rooted, a fact which must not be underestimated. Therefore, great caution must be observed in the reconstruction of national sections. First of all, an extensive ideological campaign must be initiated for the reorganization of the Workers Party, for transforming it into a centralized party and for breaking down the federalist principle of party structure as absolutely failing to comply with the requirements of an active proletarian party. This ideological campaign must be pursued simultaneously and parallel with a determined agitation for the construction of the party on the basis of factory and workshop nuclei explaining this measure. A number of instructive reports for agitators, editors, and active workers must be devoted to questions concerning the reorganization of the Workers Party, and these comrades must be clearly given to understand the need for this measure and be made active advocates of reorganization. The Central Committee and the other competent party committees must direct this campaign in the press. It will thereby become possible still further and still more extensively to acquaint the members of the party with the proposed reconstruction and its absolute necessity and usefulness. The comrades belonging to the national sections must understand that their organization is not a measure directed against the national sections, but that it exclusively pursues the general aims of the party and is in the interests of the whole party, including the national sections themselves. The aim of reorganization is not, by clumsiness and carelessness to destroy the organizations and work created by the national sections, but to strengthen the organizational influence of the Workers Party over the proletarians of all nationalities in the United States. By making use of all the available material, by demonstrating the advantages of the new forms of organization over the old by treating the question seriously and in a business-like fashion, and insistently quoting the arguments in favor of the reorganization of the Workers Party, insistently repeating them if necessary in the press, at party meetings, conferences, etc., the leading organs of the party may achieve success, all the more since the first practical steps and the success which accompanies them will speak eloquently in favor of the course adopted.

The second point is this: Perhaps in addition to the inevitable conservatives and skeptics there will be found comrades who underestimate the difficulties and who will want to break up the national sections before the new form of organizations—the nuclei—will be sufficiently numerous and strong in a particular town district, town, or region and sufficiently adapted to life, to serve as a foundation for the new form of party organization. We issue a warning against such a step. Only when the town district and town committees, as the result

of the organization of factory and street nuclei, establish close contact with these nuclei, will it be possible finally to reorganize the old organization, the national sections and the given town district or town. To break, however, one organization without creating something in its place, would be extremely disastrous. The first thing is to organize factory and street nuclei, to set up ward, town district, town, and regional committees, which are to be elected at the meetings or conferences of all the members of the party of all the nationalities in the ward, town district, town, or region (we repeat that the organization of certain ward, town district, town, etc., committees may be proceeded with even before there are nuclei in all factories and streets). At the town or town district conferences the delegates to the party congress are to be elected. The Central Committee, elected at the congress, after carefully examining all the pros and cons and after careful preparation, will through the regional, town, or town-district committees, proceed to the reorganization of one or several of the existing 17 national sections, which are sufficiently prepared for such reorganization on the basis of the fraction as above set forth. Only when the reorganization of the national section has given good results, of which we do not doubt, it will be possible gradually to proceed to the reorganization of the remainder.

The rate at which reorganization is undertaken you must determine for yourselves. We shall help you in every way we can. But for that purpose you must send us information as to the progress of the work.

I have here—I will not read it—the minutes of the committee of the C. E. C. of the Central Executive Committee—including all the instructions from the R. I. L. U. to the trade-union committee of the Communist Party.

I have here material from the central office of the Communist Party of America, dated April 13, 1930; Browder was subsequently general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, and it has the following: It shows that Browder's tutelage in the Communist Party of America still was greatly tied up with the Communist International.

A cablegram from Rutherford, Engdahl, Lovestone, Bedacht, dealing with the thesis.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
CENTRAL OFFICE,  
April 13, 1930.

DEAR COMRADES: Enclosed are Polburo minutes Nos. 25, 26, 27, and 28. The last number you received was No. 19. The intervening meetings of the Polburo were taken up with discussion of the thesis. For this reason no minutes are sent out of these meetings.

Please return these minutes immediately you have read them. As before, no minutes of the following month will be sent unless the previous ones are returned. Below we are giving the number of minutes you still owe.

You have received the confidential address to which to return the minutes.

Fraternally yours,

\_\_\_\_\_.  
(For the Secretariat).

The minutes you owe to the central office are Nos. \_\_\_\_\_.  
\_\_\_\_\_

NO. 25A—MINUTES OF POLITICAL BUREAU MEETING—MARCH 19, 1930

Present: Campbell, Foster, Williams, Briggs, Hoffbauer, Puro, Engdahl, Harvey, Hathaway, Schniess, H. George, Ford, Trachtenberg, Amter, Hall. Also: Platt, Williamson, Demon, Alpi, J. W. Johnstone.

*Draft resolution recruiting drive.*—Extensive discussion and suggestions took place.

Motion: To accept the resolution as a basis and to elect a committee of three to edit it in the spirit of the discussion.

Motion carried unanimously. Comrades Williamson, Hathaway, Alpi elected as the committee.

*Paul Siro statement.*—Comrade Campbell read for the information of the Polburo, statement of Paul Siro, dissociating himself from Lovestone renegades.

*Trade Union Unity League recruiting drive.*—Cablegram was received on the launching of a Trade Union Unity League recruiting drive.

Motion: That the drive for 50,000 members to the Trade Union Unity League be instituted and that a document be drawn up on this drive for the next meeting of the Polburo, to give concrete plans for the drive.

Motion carried unanimously.

Comrade Johnstone and Schmies reported on the preparations for the recruiting drive.

Motion: That an ideological campaign shall begin immediately in the party on the importance of this drive and of building the Trade Union Unity League.

That the Communist be opened for discussion on trade-union questions in connection with the coming Congress of the Red International of Labor Unions and the drive; that the campaign be conducted also in the Daily Worker.

That the Daily Worker management be instructed categorically to free Comrade Hoenig completely from his work on the Daily Worker so that he can take over the work of labor unity.

Motion carried unanimously.

March 6, etc., etc.

*Chicago report.*—Comrade Hathaway gave extensive report of the situation in Chicago upon his arrival, general work of the district, preparations for

Motion: That a political letter on the Chicago district be drawn up by the secretariat together with Comrades Hathaway, Williams, and Ford. That this letter to be sent to all Polburo members and if no unacceptable amendments are made, to be sent out to Chicago.

Motion unanimously accepted.

*May Day.*—Outline of Central Committee instructions for May Day.

Motion: That the secretariat shall draw up an additional document giving more complete political direction for May Day activity.

Motion carried unanimously.

*Plenum agenda.*—Secretariat proposes the following plenum agenda; on March 30 and 31:

(1) Discussion of thesis, with supplementary report on the March 6 demonstrations and March 29 unemployment conference.

(2) Discussion on Chicago district, in connection with the lessons that are to be drawn therefrom for the party in general, and all the districts.

(3) Our work in the South.

Trade-union conference of enlarged plenum on April 1.

Organization conference on April 2.

Proposals unanimously accepted.

Cable from Communist Party of Great Britain upon the arrest of the unemployed demonstration committee.

Meeting adjourned 11:45 p. m.

Fraternally submitted.

CAMPBELL,  
(For the Polburo.)

---

NO. 26A—MINUTES OF POLITICAL BUREAU MEETING—MARCH 26, 1930

Present: Campbell, Foster, Minor, Briggs, Engdahl, Hathaway, Dunne, Williams, Schmies, H. George, Trachtenberg, Tallentire, Amter, Hall, also Platt, Williamson, Damon, Alpi, Rijak, Moreau, Primoff, Vivo, Pat Devine.

*Congressional election program.*—Draft of plan of work for congressional elections presented (attached).

Motion. That we immediately make arrangements to send three party organizers into the Dakotas, northern Minnesota, and Kansas in connection with the work for the election campaign:

That the Polburo elect a committee of five to be in charge of the work for the fall elections—congressional, senatorial, and State—to be known as the national congressional campaign committee, with a comrade in charge as chairman of the committee;

That the draft be accepted, the Org Department to bring in recommendations for the committee.

**Motions carried unanimously.**

*Draft thesis and plenum.*—Cablegram from Max and Will dealing with thesis read.

Motion. That a small committee be elected to bring in a rewritten draft of the thesis within the next 2 days on the basis of the original document and the cablegram that this be presented to a meeting of the Polburo before the plenum; this committee also to take charge of all other definite proposals in regard to the plenum opening, etc.

Motion unanimously carried. Comrades Campbell, Foster, Minor, Williams, and Hathaway selected as committee.

*May Day resolution.*—Discussion took place on the draft resolution.

Motion. That the resolution shall include reference to the statement of the SP that they will organize demonstrations on May Day;

That immediate arrangements be made to prepare a May Day manifesto to be issued quite some time in advance of May Day;

Instead of "brutal form of capitalist rationalization" we shall state: "capitalist rationalization";

That the portion demanding release of political prisoners shall state first, "especially the Gastonia defendants";

Last part of first paragraph, page 3, shall read "revolutionary unions and unemployed councils."

Resolution and all amendments proposed accepted.

*Sale of workers center.*—

Motion. That we accept the offer to sell the center for \$450,000 and lease for 1 year; that the sum to be realized on this sale shall be set aside for the purpose of securing a much lower-valued headquarters for our printing plants and the party, in the same general neighborhood of the city.

Motion. That the building be not sold but that funds be raised through (1) an appeal to the masses, and (2) a levy on nonproletarian members of the party in order to hold the building.

Motion. That the Polcom create a special commission to investigate all political and financial advantages and disadvantages of this proposal as well as prepare drastic measures to help radically change the financial situation of the party.

Last motion only carried, unanimously. Comrades Minor, Dunne, and Amter elected as the commission.

Meeting adjourned 12:30 a. m.

Fraternally submitted,

CAMPBELL  
(For the Polburo).

In other words, a draft of a thesis on the matter of the Communist International was sent to the American party, and representatives happened to be in Moscow and it was considered by the policy committee of the party and a motion was made to form a committee, that a committee be elected to bring in a rewritten draft of this within the next 2 days on the basis of the original document and cablegram, and this was presented to the meeting.

This was an instruction regarding the plenum of America, transmitted by representatives of the Communist Party to the policy committee, and was considered by the policy committee and they made certain changes as instructed by the Communist International.

I have here the minutes of the policy committee dealing with the report to the Executive Committee of the Communist International, where the policy committee voted on that question.

Now we have here what I consider important on the South Slovakian Federation of the Communist Party, that it does not represent the Comintern, and I have the policy committee minutes showing the vote, wherein Comrade Green made a motion that we appoint a committee of one major, one minor, and Comrade Green to make recommendations to the C. E. C.

Amendments by comrade that one comrade from each group, Novak and Fisher be added, and you have in the minutes Comrade Green's statement, as his opinion that there is no reason why the C. C. should interfere with the arrangements made by the New York district executive committee.

MR. WHITLEY. In other words, that was a case where Green, Comintern representative, is making suggestions and taking an active part in the affairs of the party in this country.

MR. GITLOW. Yes.

Now, in reference to the C. I. representative to this country, Comrade Foster was very anxious to get in touch with the representative as soon as he arrived. So he appeared at a meeting of the secretariat and he made the following motion: That we send a representative to Mexico, the representative to be Gomez, to find out as to the whereabouts of the representative of the Communist International. Foster was of the opinion that he got lost in Mexico on his way to the United States and he wanted to send Gomez there to find him in Mexico.

MR. WHITLEY. That is also in keeping with your previous testimony, Mr. Gitlow, to the effect that these Comintern representatives when they were coming to this country to represent the Communist International used every precaution to conceal their identities and came in by indirect routes?

MR. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

MR. WHITLEY. This is a case of one coming in through Mexico?

MR. GITLOW. That is so. The reason he came in through Mexico was that at that time the Mexican Government had an Embassy of the Soviet Union in Mexico.

I reported this morning that all kinds of conferences were arranged to enlist the support of the marine workers on a world scale by the Communist International. The American party was instructed to organize in Montevideo, and this is a report on that conference.

(Mr. Gitlow here placed in evidence a report headed "The Montevideo Conference of Marine Workers—Report and Recommendations," signed by Harrison George. This conference took place at Montevideo, Uruguay, on March 20, 21, 1926. The report declares "It was the first experience of our movement in projecting Communist programs in an international way into the labor movement of South America.")

MR. THOMAS. What was the date of that particular report, Mr. Gitlow?

MR. GITLOW. That was in 1926.

I told you about the organization of the party membership into fractions in the various organizations. I have here the resolution of the party on the organization of the party into fractions. The resolution is as follows:

#### MINUTES OF POLCOM, OCTOBER 13, 1926

#### INSTRUCTIONS TO PARTY TRADE-UNION FRACTIONS

In order to intensify the application of the C. E. C. resolution on "The broadening of the T. U. E. L. and the building of an oppositional bloc in conformity with the C. I. decision," the following measures shall be put into effect immediately:

#### *Formation of broad local general groups*

Under the immediate direction of the respective district secretaries and trade-union committees, steps shall immediately be taken for the formation of

left-wing groups, as broad as possible, in all industrial centers. To this end the following policy shall be adopted:

1. Where there is already a definite broad oppositional foment existing in the local general trade-union movement, or where it is possible to develop one around some burning issue in the very near future, such as the setting up of an oppositional slate in the union elections, the establishment of broad committees for organizing the unorganized or for the formation of a labor party, etc., steps shall be taken directly for the formation of such a broad united front of the oppositional elements. In the resultant organization our policy shall be to bring in as much as practicable of our general program of action and to gradually crystallize our fractions and the more conscious left elements into a definite left wing within the broad movement.

2. Where there is no immediate prospect of developing such broad united-front movements with the oppositional elements around single issues, local conferences shall be called as soon as possible on the basis of our general program of action and left-wing organizations formed of those who subscribe to it, this program of action to include a militant fight against the employers, the organization of the unorganized, the formation of a labor party, amalgamation, democratization of the unions, and the elimination of gangsterism and corruption. Where such left-wing groups are established they shall be considered as instruments for the organization of wider oppositional movements, and to this end they shall energetically strive to put into effect their local programs of work, calling for the formation of joint election slates, organizing committees, labor-party committees, strike-relief committees, etc. When broad local general opposition united-front movements are formed the existing left-wing groups shall, except in unusual cases, merge with them and become their left wing.

That is, the point 1 policy is to first form the broad oppositional movement and then crystallize a left wing, comprising our party fractions and other left elements within it, and the point 2 policy is to first form the left wing of fractions and other conscious elements and then build a broader movement around it.

In accordance with the foregoing general instructions, the following practical steps shall be taken:

In all industrial centers, broad local general oppositional groups or left-wing groups shall be formed, as local circumstances dictate. They shall be given such names as may be deemed most expedient.

The meetings for the formation of these local general groups shall be arranged tourwise so that they may be covered by T. U. E. L. organizers.

In the formation of these various local groups the initiative of nonparty elements shall be developed.

It shall be our aim to bring all these local groups under the general leadership, official or unofficial, of the T. U. E. L. general committee, to secure their acceptance of Labor Unity as their official organ, and to get their support for the workers' educational fund.

#### *Formation of broad local union groups*

In all localities and in all unions the local union fractions, under the immediate control of local trade union committees and leading fractions, shall at once proceed to establish broader groups in their respective local unions. Special attention shall be paid to the local unions in heavy and key industries.

The policy outlined in the foregoing general instructions 1 and 2 shall also apply in the case of the formation of broader groups in local unions. Where burning issues exist, broad united fronts shall be created on that basis, but otherwise general left groups shall be at once formed upon the basis of our trade-union action program, these left-wing groups to immediately strive for the formation of broader groups, as above explained. In all cases the fractions will be required to establish groups broader than mere party lines, whether the new groups shall be left wing in character, or broad united fronts, depends upon local circumstances.

These local union oppositional groups shall be given such names as may be most expedient. They shall be drawn under the leadership, official or unofficial, of the national industrial committees and local general groups in their respective industries and localities. They shall support Labor Unity and the various finance systems of their national industrial committees, and also the workers' education fund.

*Formation of broad local industrial groups*

In accordance with the general instructions 1 and 2, broad oppositional movements shall be developed among all the local unions of one trade in a given locality (joint boards, district councils, etc.) and among all the local unions in a given local industry (building trades councils, metal trades councils, etc), applying the foregoing policy regarding names, finance, Labor Unity, and the general leadership of the T. U. E. L.

*The national movement*

As rapidly as practicable, national industrial committees, based on the present general system, shall be organized in all the principal industries now without such committees. There shall also be organized national-union committees to cover the most important individual unions, these national union committees to work under the general direction of their respective national industrial committees. The N. I. C.'s shall publish their own papers, adopt financial systems, and be known by such names as may be most convenient to secure the best results. They shall include workers in various centers, including nonparty militants.

The general committee of the T. U. E. L. shall hold an enlarged meeting in Chicago on \_\_\_\_\_ to which shall be invited party and nonparty left wingers from various cities and industries. This meeting shall issue a statement to the labor movement stressing the nonparty character of the T. U. E. L. and emphasizing its program of struggle around concrete issues. The meeting shall also develop the workers' education fund, work up detailed plans for organizing left-wing and progressive groups, map out general left-wing programs for the various industries, prepare for the coming national conference of the T. U. E. L., and broaden out the general committee to include militants in the various cities. It shall take definite steps to build up Labor Unity.

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER.

September 28, 1926.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to take you off your chain of thought there, but do you have information with reference to their cooperative movement, their effort to spread cooperative organizations?

Mr. GITLOW. I will present to the committee a detailed report on cooperatives.

The CHAIRMAN. And also on their effort to use consumer councils for the purpose of spreading the Communist doctrine to destroy private business and initiative?

Mr. GITLOW. That did not take place in my time, and I am not competent to report on that phase of the activity.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. GITLOW. Now we have the meetings of the political committee on October 29, 1926. The political committee of the Communist Party in America had as its important consideration then the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the question of Zinoviev as chairman of the Communist Party. This includes a series of motions approving the removal of Zinoviev as chairman of the Communist International—at the request, of course, of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

I have here the following:

#### MINUTES OF POLCOM, OCTOBER 29, 1926

RESOLUTION ON THE SITUATION IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION AND THE WITHDRAWAL OF COMRADE ZINOVIEV FROM WORK IN THE COMINTERN

The central committee of the Workers (Communist) Party has on two occasions expressed its support of the central committee of the Communist Party of

the Soviet Union in the struggle against the opposition led by Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev. It has endorsed and reaffirms its endorsement of the general line of policy of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as against that of the opposition, for development of the Socialist economic system in the Soviet Union and also condemned the effort of the opposition in organizing systematically a factional opposition within our Russian brother party. It considered these activities the more destructive and subject to condemnation, because of the position of Comrade Zinoviev as president of the Communist International made his un-Leninist attitude in breaking the discipline of the party a bad example which can only have a destructive influence in all the affiliated parties of the Comintern.

The central committee of the Workers (Communist) Party saw in the actions of Comrade Zinoviev a course unworthy of a disciplined member of any Communist Party, and certainly incompatible with the duties of the president of the Communist International.

While the central committee of the Workers (Communist) Party welcomes the fact that the opposition led by Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev have now recognized the danger of their course and acknowledged their error insofar as the breaches of discipline are concerned, their belated recognition of their mistake in this respect cannot serve to excuse their actions.

The central committee of the Workers (Communist) Party, therefore, approves the withdrawal of Comrade Zinoviev by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a delegate to the Communist International. The leaders of our Communist International must be free from the blemish of conscious un-Leninist behaviour. The executive committee of the Communist International must be free of undisciplined and therefore harmful elements.

The Central Committee of the Workers (Communist) Party sees in the actions of the plenum of the Central Committee and the Control Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union against the leaders of the opposition, Comrades Zinoviev, Trotzky, and others a well-earned censure for their disruptive behavior. It expresses sincere hopes that these Comrades will heed the warning and will in the future conduct themselves as disciplined members of the Communist International.

The unanimity with which the E. C. C. I. approved the action of the plenum of the Central Committee on the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union against Comrades Zinoviev, Trotzky, and others is an effective challenge to the lies of the capitalist press and its lackeys, the social Democrats, who attempted to picture the struggle of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for unity as a fight of Comrades Stalin and Bucharin for, and Comrades Zinoviev and Trotzky against, the liquidation of the Communist International. The procedure of the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and of the Executive Committee of the Communist International against the opposition in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is proof of the inner strength and determination of victory of the Communist International.

In view of the failure of the opposition in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to abandon their un-Leninist orientation the central committee of the Workers (Communist) Party of America feels in duty bound to join the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in an ideological struggle within its own ranks against these deviations, and to help unify the whole Communist International behind the Leninist principles and tactics of its leader, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

#### MINUTES OF SECRETARIAT JANUARY 19, 1928

Present: Foster, Lovestone.

Cable from Profintern.

Cable asking Robert Dunn to head formal Independent Economic Research Institute in Shanghai.

Motion by Foster: To reject the proposal and inform accordingly.  
(Voting.) Carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. What does Dunn do now?

Mr. GITLOW. He is also engaged in the same kind of activity, and is one of the front men in the party, working in liberal organizations, and so forth.

This telegram, which I believe was sent from Los Angeles on March 6, 1929, shows how Russian events were considered the most important events in the Communist Party in America. This telegram states:

[Western Union]

MARCH 6, 1929.

MORRIS YUSEM,

*43 East One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y.:*

Following rumors spread all over district Molotov replaces Bucharin, Foster, new secretary party, Lovestone, Bittelman, going across. Someone named Mingulin, new head of Anglo-American commission, who denounces Lovestone group minority, spread factional documents to this effect. Why no convention? information? Are rumors true? Telegraph immediate reply; give all facts.

E. MARSHALL.

Showing that Russian politics played the decisive role in the inner politics of the Communist Party of the United States.

I have here a chart which deals with the reorganization of the Communist Party of America in May 1926. It shows the total membership, the number of shop papers, number of fractions, number of shop nuclei, and so forth; and the reorganization of the party is ordered by the Communist International.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if I may see that.

(The paper referred to was handed to the chairman.)

Mr. MASON. Was the reorganization carried out as ordered?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course.

Here is a document on the organization of fractions in the language organizations—

The CHAIRMAN. Before we pass to that, I think this is rather interesting here. It says:

October 1, 1929. Results of reorganization in the Workers Communist Party of America.

Then it has a number of cities reorganized. It gives Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Indianapolis, Seattle, Los Angeles, and so forth. It gives the number of shop nuclei in each place. Those are the fractions?

Mr. GITLOW. No; the shop nuclei were a form of organization which the Communist International insisted that the party carry out. If there were five members of the Communist Party working in a shop, they formed a branch of the Communist Party in that shop, and that branch was known as a Communist nucleus, and a regular unit of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. It says that in Boston there were 197 members in the shop nuclei; in New York, 995; Philadelphia, 128; Buffalo, 122; Pittsburgh, 299; Cleveland, 190; Detroit, 405; Chicago, 545; Indianapolis, 35; and so on. Then it has the number of members of shop nuclei in each industry. Then it takes up the needle industry 437: shoe leather, 104; metal, 128; furniture, 27; printing, 8; automobiles, 17; oil, 3. It goes on down with each industry and gives the number of members in each nucleus in the industry. Then it gives the percentage of average attendance at shop nuclei meetings: Average attendance at Boston, 50 percent; 79.7 percent in New York; and so on, and so forth. Then it gives the industries in which the shop papers are published; the number of street nuclei; number of members in the street nuclei; the percentage of average attendance at street nuclei meetings. Then it gives the main questions considered

at the nuclei meetings, including housing, health, schools, and so forth.

So this is really a very exhaustive and detailed plan and report, is it not?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. At that time it did not show the membership of the party as very large, did it?

Mr. GITLOW. It did not show the complete membership. It only dealt with those who were organized into shop and street nuclei. But the total membership was not so very large.

Then we have a letter that was sent out by the party to all the units of the party dealing with the party's campaign, and particularly with the party's campaign against imperialism and war. Some of the instructions are as follows:

Increasing the number of shop nuclei, strengthening them, and digging the party's roots more deeply into the factories, as an indispensable part of the party's preparation of its organization, form, composition, and activities for the war situation.

The CHAIRMAN. For the war situation?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; in preparation for the outbreak of war, the party should strengthen its roots more deeply into the factories.

The CHAIRMAN. What date was that?

Mr. GITLOW. That was in 1928; December 12, 1928.

Mr. WHITLEY. As I understand it, at that time the party in Russia, or the Soviet Government, was convinced that there was going to be a war very shortly, in which they might be involved?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. I was present when those questions were under discussion, and they were convinced that in a very short time the Soviet Government would be involved in a war.

Mr. WHITLEY. And they were instructed to send out this type of instructions in preparation for the advent of a war?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, they were to prepare themselves to commit acts of sabotage?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, we will let the document speak for itself.

#### INSTRUCTION 8

WORKERS (COMMUNIST) PARTY OF AMERICA,  
43 EAST ONE HUNDRED TWENTY-FIFTH STREET,  
*New York City, December 12, 1928.*

#### To All Party Units:

DEAR COMRADES: The two outstanding tasks before the party at the present moment are:

(1) The struggle against imperialism and the war danger; (2) the fight to maintain the Bolshevik line of our party—the struggle against the Right danger and Trotskyism.

\* \* \* \* \*

7. Increasing the number of shop nuclei, strengthening them, and digging the party's roots more deeply into the factories is an indispensable part of the party's preparation of its organizational form, composition, and activities, for the war situation.

8. Flexible combination of legal and illegal work; strengthening our apparatus for illegal work.

9. Manifold increase in our work among the armed forces.

\* \* \* \* \*

15. The unification of the party on the line and under the leadership of the Communist International.

Organize for the struggle against imperialist war.

Mobilize for war on capitalism.

Not a man, not a cent for military, naval, and other war expenses of the capitalist Government.

Demand withdrawal of troops from Nicaragua.

Aid the strikers in Colombia with every means.

Fight with and for the working class against the capitalist class and its imperialist wars.

Fraternally yours,

CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,

(Signed) JAY LOVESTONE,

Executive Secretary.

Mr. Voorhis. What do you suppose "illegal work" means there, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. Gitlow. It means every phase of illegal activity because the Communist movement is built on the proposition that the end justifies the means.

Mr. Voorhis. That is, illegal from the standpoint of the laws of the country?

Mr. Gitlow. Illegal, of course, from the standpoint of the laws of the country.

Then it concludes with the following:

The unification of the party on the lines and under the leadership of the Communist International.

Mr. Thomas. May I see that document?

(The paper referred to was handed to Mr. Thomas.)

The CHAIRMAN. Now, if that policy had been carried out to this date, the party having made such rapid strides, as Earl Browder testified, and as reported to the last Congress, with a hundred thousand members—and evidently it appears to be more prosperous now than it ever has been—by this time they should have perfected very careful plans and should be in an excellent position to do illegal work in the event of war; I mean if this had happened in 1928. They were then laying plans and at that time they did not have anything like the number that they now have. According to Browder, the greatest growth they have ever had has been from 1935 to the present time, and with the great progress the party has made they should be in an excellent position for all illegal works, including espionage and sabotage, in case of war.

Mr. Gitlow. I should judge so.

Mr. Thomas. Mr. Gitlow, as I understand it, this document is addressed to the Workers' Communist Party of America, New York City, dated December 12, 1928, addressed to all party units, and it is from the general executive committee, signed by Jay Lovestone, executive secretary.

Mr. Gitlow. That is correct.

Mr. Thomas. This is the original document?

Mr. Gitlow. That is the original document that was sent to the units; yes. The thousands of units of the party received that document as instructions to the units.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time that was going on were there any plans to penetrate the Government in order to get the party members in strategic positions in the Government itself—to get Government jobs of importance? Did you have any plans at the time you were there?

Mr. GITLOW. No; we did not have any very definite plans worked out in that respect. The definite plans had to do with penetrating the factories and industries. We laid plans for the penetration of the armed forces of the United States. We already had organized the youth to join the C. M. T. C., some of our party members to join the National Guard, and some to join the Regular Army. At the same time we organized the ex-service men's league, which we controlled.

Mr. STARNES. What is the name of that league; do you recall?

Mr. GITLOW. The Workers' Ex-Service Men's League of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever discuss in your meetings at that time the advisability of getting appointive jobs in State and Federal administrations?

Mr. GITLOW. We only discussed that, but not very concretely because we had practically no contacts in the Government as such at that particular time. So we only discussed it, but not for decision at the particular time of the advisability particularly of being informed of what actions the Government was prepared to take against the Communist movement.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, the infiltration of Government bureaus is a later phase which happened after this gentleman was through.

The CHAIRMAN. But I was wondering whether the foundation was for that, as it was for this other proposition. In 1928 and 1929 they were laying the foundation for the Army and Navy and other agencies, and I was just wondering whether the same plan was being made in other bureaus in 1928.

Mr. MASON. I should suppose other witnesses would be able to bring those things out.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, in the preparation for the Army, were there individuals or committees especially assigned to carry out that work for the party?

Mr. GITLOW. We had an antimilitarist committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you recall Paul Crouch and Walter Trumbull?

Mr. GITLOW. In the beginning they played an important role in the preparation of work in the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. With reference to this penetration of these various agencies which you have described, Mr. Browder testified that for every Communist there were 10 sympathizers. That was the estimate he gave.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Just as Mr. Kuhn said, I think, for every bund member there were some 5 to 10 sympathizers?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, of course, the bund has sympathizers' groups; I mean those who formally joined as sympathizers groups in the bund?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Browder denies that they have any such place for sympathizers to go; in other words, no formal application for joining a sympathizers' group. Now, if that be true, that they do have 10 sympathizers to every 1 Communist, and if it be true that the Communists have a hundred thousand members, as Mr. Browder says they have, in the United States, then each member has a tremendous influence, far beyond the numerical strength of the organization. I

mean the organization, only having a hundred thousand numerically, has much more power and influence; because if it can reach out to a million sympathizers and obtain aid from these sympathizers, then you have a much more serious menace to the country than you would if it were just confined to a hundred thousand; is that right?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, if you take Browder's figures at their face value—

The CHAIRMAN. You think he is inclined to exaggerate?

Mr. GITLOW. I think he is inclined to exaggerate a great deal. I would like to see the financial report of the national office of the Communist Party, particularly the report on dues payments, and then I could break that down and show you what the real membership of the Communist Party is.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand, his financial statements account for about 75,000 members. Is that right?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Seventy-two thousand.

The CHAIRMAN. Seventy-two thousand members. Of course, he makes up the difference between 72,000 and 100,000 by saying that something happens to the money, as I remember his testimony, from the time it leaves the local unit or the branch.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It disappears before it reaches the general office. Now, he did not make plain what became of the difference between the 72,000 and the 100,000, but somewhere in the process some of it evidently sticks to somebody's fingers, or something happens, according to what he said himself.

Mr. GITLOW. I think the 75,000 is also an exaggerated statement, a grossly exaggerated statement of the real membership of the Communist Party. As I say, if I could get the figures—because the dues stamps are sold directly by the national office to the district.

The CHAIRMAN. Do we have that financial statement?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose, at a later date, you let him examine it.

Mr. GITLOW. Now, as to the influence—that 1 party member can influence 10. Well, it may work the other way, too. That relationship is an old one. The old Social Democratic Party of Germany maintained that the vote that it got in Germany was on the basis of 10 to 1; for every member of the Social Democratic Party of Germany they got 10 votes. If they had a hundred thousand members, they got a million votes. And that has prevailed in the radical labor movement all this time, and they figure that 1 member is worth the influence of 10 others.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think there is any basis for that?

Mr. GITLOW. That is very difficult to determine. If you have a stupid party member, who does not know how to act, he may spoil sympathizers for you; and another one, who does know, may be worth more than 1 to 10.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you think is the real influence of the Communist Party outside of its membership? What would be your estimate of the number of sympathizers; that is, those who, while they do not belong to the party, yet do actually sympathize with the Communist Party and its aims?

Mr. GITLOW. I think the sympathizers can be put into a number of categories. There are sympathizers who will go along with the party

in whatever the party does. That group of sympathizers is limited and small in number. Then there are sympathizers who have been brought under party influence because they believe the party is out for idealistic purposes and is supporting good causes, which they are in favor of, and they support the party; but as soon as they realize that the party does not they will not back up the party; and certainly in a war situation they will steer clear of the party. So you cannot take the sympathizers as one lump.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. There are different degrees of sympathy?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course.

The CHAIRMAN. And therefore different degrees of influence can be exerted by the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Certainly.

Mr. VOORHIS. In other words, Mr. Gitlow, when you explain the degree of control, in the first place, that the Communist International and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union exercise over the Communist Party of America, then when you explain what their plans are with regard to a situation in which the United States might find itself at war, it is not an accurate picture to say that all the claims that are made for Communist sympathy, and so on, in the ranks of the people mean that those people would accept that type of leadership or would go along with that kind of program of sabotage that you have described?

Mr. GITLOW. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you are right about that.

Mr. VOORHIS. Could I ask you this question, Mr. Gitlow: To what extent do you believe that the rank and file of the membership—I am talking about real members now of the Communist Party—to what extent are they informed of the real truth about the set-up of the party, such as you have described? Are they pretty largely informed as to that or not?

Mr. GITLOW. The membership of the party is informed of the set-up. They fully realize that they are members of a disciplined organization. They could not remain members of the party if they were not. Whether they will stand up under fire is another question.

For example, I have experience in this matter. When we split away from the Socialist Party and formed the Communist Party we took out of the Socialist Party approximately 60,000 members. Then came the Palmer raids, in which all headquarters of the Communist movement were raided and the foreign-born members of the party were rounded up for deportation, and so forth. It was a great attack upon the party, and as a result of that attack we lost thousands of our members; but we still retained approximately in the two parties about 15,000 members. Those were the members that we could depend upon, because they stood up under fire. How many of the party members today will stand up under fire, if the party is under fire, we can only tell when the crisis arises.

Mr. VOORHIS. I read in the paper this noon an article describing conditions that were happening in France, in which it said that large numbers of people who formerly belonged to the Communist Party in France, and did up to this very time, had denounced their membership, and so on, and the French Communist Party was in the process of disappearing. I wonder whether you think that is true, and

whether you do not believe that a similar thing might well happen to the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. I think that is true with France, and in a crisis of a similar nature in the United States that is bound to happen here, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is another thing: You were talking about this influence of the Communists. The same thing is true of the Nazi group. For instance, take Pelley, Deatherage, or any of these fellows. To the extent that they spread certain antiracial or antireligious propaganda, there are a great many people who sympathize with that who are loyal Americans. I mean, they are people who would fight and die for the country, but they have the same views on this race question that Mr. Pelley does, for example. But they do not know that many of these Nazi leaders in the United States have gone on record in favor of a military dictatorship. For instance, when you begin to study their writings and what they have said themselves, you find that they are in favor of a military dictatorship. So the same thing would apply to both groups. The influence might extend pretty far in one direction, and yet be very narrow in another direction. Would not that be true?

Mr. GITLOW. But the one thing you must keep in mind is that I do not speak for the intelligence of the Nazi groups. I think their level of intelligence is very low. I think Fritz Kuhn is a bully, and, as far as having any brains is concerned, I do not think he possesses much mental capacity. The same cannot be said about the leaders of the Communist Party. The Communist Party leaders are trained political thinkers who have been in the movement for a long time. You see, they have not just been in the movement on the spur of the moment. Browder has been a member of the Communist Party since 1921. That is a long period of time. And before that he was a member of the labor movement. Foster has been a member of trade-union activity, also a member of the trade-union activity in the Communist movement. So that you have people who have seriously considered the problem and are of the highest intellectual caliber, and they have been trained in the art of how to meet political situations; and Lenin was a master of that.

And if a crisis should occur in the United States the Communists would not be foolish enough to raise the slogan immediately for setting up a proletarian dictatorship in the United States. They would call for all land to farmers, you see, and all factories for workers, and more liberty for the working class, and so forth. To abolish the parties of the capitalist class—the Republican and Democratic Parties—they would raise democratic, liberty, and social slogans which would put the mass of the population in back of them as the political leaders of the country. And once they would get power, then they would institute their form of government, and the people would wake up the next morning and would not know how it all happened, just as they did in Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. One more point there. I read not long ago, I think in the writings of Lenin, about the advisability of Communists to encourage and support every crackpot scheme that was proposed. I have the exact quotation at home, and I think I will bring it down in the morning, because the advice was this—take, for instance, inflation; he said, "We Communists know inflation is a dangerous thing, but anything and everything you can do to promote economic chaos is

serving the ends of communism." Does that illustrate what you said, that communism really teaches that the end justifies the means? In other words, the morality of it is that "we will do anything to promote communism"?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I don't know whether that particular statement is a genuine statement of Lenin's viewpoint verbatim, because he would not make a statement of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. No; he did not make it in that language, but I am going to bring it with me tomorrow, because it looks to me—let me put it this way: Is that true from your experience, that their proposal is to join some unsound movements, or crackpot movements, or anything for the purpose of gaining their end?

Mr. GITLOW. That would depend. The Communist Party leadership would consider whether, in advance of such movement, if it would further the interests of the party or discredit the party. They would not likely go into such tactics; they would consider very seriously whether the tactic would achieve the result.

For instance, suppose they would support inflation and the people of the country became aroused as a result of that inflation; then you can charge the Communist Party with supporting inflation, and that would discredit the party and hurt them very much. So they would be very careful. But, in the main, they might secretly and underhandedly support all movements or all actions which would undermine the influence and power of the capitalist class and the existing rulers of the country and pave the way for their coming into power. That is what they would do, not join up with the movement.

Mr. STARNES. On the subject of morality: Mr. Browder said something about there being a code of ethics and a code of morals for the Communists, on the one hand, and a code for the general world on the other—words to that effect. In other words, he said they had a code of morals and ethics that differed from the code of morals and ethics of the non-Communists. Have you anything to say in that connection?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, the Communists are bound by one moral code only: Whatever furthers the interests of communism is justified. And they look upon the encouraging of abiding by laws, law abiding, as bourgeois virtues, and they consider bourgeois virtues with contempt.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, how do they propose now to accomplish communism in the United States? Do they still adhere—or are you going to cover that? They appear to have changed their tactics, to have changed their policy. What brought about that change? They used openly to profess they were in favor of the overthrow of the Government by force and violence; now they deny that. Are you going to discuss that change in tactics and strategy?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I did not intend to discuss it, but I can answer you very briefly now, that this change has nothing to do with the capture of power in the United States, but is predicated on Russian considerations.

The Soviet Government was anxious to build up a front in all the countries in favor of the Soviet Union in the present critical international situation and are ready to use all kinds of tactics; in other words, to put out a bait and catch as many fish as they can and tie them up to the Soviet band wagon. And if in the United States they could put out they were supporting democracy, supporting social security, they are against violence, and so forth, and make a big mass front behind the whole program and line up a friendly mass base to the

Soviet Union, they would further the interests of Soviet diplomacy in the international field.

MR. STARNES. That accounts, then, of course, for the fact that this policy was adopted in 1935 at the Seventh World Congress in Moscow?

MR. GITLOW. Yes.

MR. STARNES. It was along about that time that fascism, as exemplified, we will say, by Mussolini and Hitler, was beginning to make itself felt in the international situation, and it was probably a change of tactics then on the part of the Communist Party in order to meet that threat of fascism.

MR. GITLOW. To be more concrete, that change of policy occurred at the time when the Soviet Government made a military alliance with the Republics of France and Czechoslovakia. That was the capitalist governments that they sought before to overthrow. So, naturally, the whole policy of communism outside had to be changed to conform with that act on the part of the Soviet Government.

MR. STARNES. And then the Soviet Government at once began to recognize Czechoslovakia and France as great democracies?

MR. GITLOW. Yes.

MR. STARNES. Now, what is the attitude of Communists toward religion? Did you propose to treat of that at any time during your statement?

MR. GITLOW. No; I did not propose to treat of that.

MR. STARNES. Do they have an attitude with reference to it?

MR. GITLOW. Well, they do hold an attitude, a philosophic attitude, and they have a practical attitude on that.

MR. STARNES. What is the philosophic attitude?

MR. GITLOW. The philosophic attitude is since the Communist movement is based upon the philosophy of materialism, they are opposed to religion and the spread of religion as the opium of the people. For that reason, they do everything in their power to undermine honest religion. On the other hand, their practical attitude is that once they have broken the power of the organized church in Russia, they permit freedom of worship of any religion in Russia under those conditions.

MR. THOMAS. I want to ask a question right there.

THE CHAIRMAN. All right.

MR. THOMAS. Mr. Gitlow, Mr. Browder said that a very large percentage of the rank-and-file members of the Communist Party were citizens. I believe he said—he named a figure well over 90 percent, if I am not mistaken. Is that correct?

MR. GITLOW. Well, it might be correct, because the Communist movement for years, even in my time, did everything in its power to see to it that the members of the party who are not citizens became citizens of the United States.

MR. THOMAS. Another question: Do you know whether it was the custom to have the rank-and-file members to secure their citizenship illegally as well as legally?

MR. GITLOW. Well, in my time they secured citizenship legally. You had to get out your first papers and then get witnesses. It was an easy process; there was no need to resort to any illegal act to secure it.

MR. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest that Mr. Gitlow has considerable addition specific material to present.

The CHAIRMAN. Let him finish, then, before he is interrupted. Go ahead.

Mr. GITLOW. Now, I want to present, briefly, some material to show the voluminous intercourse between the Communist International in Moscow and the American Communist Party, and I will go through this very quickly, because I believe the material speaks for itself.

Here is a decision of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the American question [exhibiting], a report of the American commission in the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, which was held on May 20, 1924, to consider the American party situation. (Report of 13 pages was submitted for the record.)

Here is a copy of one of my speeches which I delivered in Moscow before the American Commission of the Communist International in March 1929 [exhibiting]. (March 12, 1929, speech of 13 pp. submitted for the record.)

Here is a letter [exhibiting] from Comrade Zack to Kussinin, secretary of the Communist International, sent to him on July 29, 1927 (two single-spaced pages).

Here is a copy of a speech by Weinstone to the C. I. on American party matters [exhibiting]. (June 13, 1927, 12 pp.)

Here is a report to Losovsky [exhibiting], at that time head of the Red International of Trade Unions, by Zack, on the needle-trade situation (May 1927, 3 pp.).

Here is a printed report: Declaration of the Political committee on the American Question; Resolution Adopted by the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, published in broad headlines in the Daily Worker [exhibiting] (Aug. 3, 1927, p. 3).

#### AGREEMENT FOR THE CARRYING OUT OF THE RESOLUTION ON THE AMERICAN QUESTION ADOPTED BY THE PRESIDIUM OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMINTERN

We declare that the unity of the Workers (Communist) Party is now more than ever an imperative necessity. The international situation, the ever-increasing war danger, the increasing attacks of the Government, and the reactionary trade-union bureaucracy demand the consolidation of all the forces of the party for the fulfillment of the great tasks which are before the party.

The unity of the party can be achieved only through the liquidation of the existing groups and factions, the cessation of the factional struggle, and the amalgamation of the party into one unified whole. We pledge ourselves to work in this direction with all our power and without any reservation.

The first and most important prerequisite for the merging of all the factions is the coming nearer and the unification of the two main historical streams in the party which, until now, have stood most sharply against each other—the majority of the Polburo, and the group of Comrade Foster. We pledge ourselves to convince the entire party of the need of such a step and to avoid any actions which would hinder this development.

At the same time we will make every effort in order to bring about a complete merger with the Weinstone-Cannon group also. This group likewise must work with all its power for the accomplishment of unity between the majority of the Polecom and the group of Comrade Foster, with the aim to merge itself also with the other groups. Against the Cannon-Weinstone group there should be no struggle carried on any more than against the other groups. We are of the opinion that the leading forces of all three groups can work together as they contain in their ranks complementary forces.

We pledge ourselves jointly to carry out the following measures:

(1) The committee for the preparation of the party convention shall consist of the following comrades:

Members: Majority of Polcom, Lovestone, Bitlow, Bedacht; opposition, Foster, Bittelman, Cannon.

Candidate: Minor or Puro; Weinstone.

(2) The preconvention discussion shall be conducted on the basis of the resolution of the Presidium of the Communist International. We shall strive to prepare joint resolutions on any further questions. We will seek to obtain the majority of the party convention only within these limits. In accordance with the instruction of the Executive Committee, Communist International, there will be no organizational changes or removals of party workers in the preconvention period. The changes made in the district committee of New York in the absence of Comrade Weinstone shall be reversed and the former members of the district committee shall be reinstated in their functions.

(3) The elections to the party convention shall be carried out on the basis of proportional representation from the nuclei up till the election of party delegates to the national convention from the district conventions. The elections from the nuclei to the city or district conventions commence on August 5. District conventions shall be held not later than August 21. The national convention shall be held on August 31. For each 5 members or major fraction thereof there shall be elected 1 delegate. Shop and street nuclei shall have the same basis for representation. For each 200 paid-up members there shall be 1 delegate to the national convention. The delegates shall be elected by the district conventions. All party units which have paid up their dues until June 1, 1927, have the right to participate in the election. The party units which were founded after June 1, 1927, have not the right to participate in the elections to the party convention. The same applies to party members who enter the party after the 1st of June 1927.

Members of the Young Workers League shall not be transferred into the party in the preconvention period. Only such members of the Young Workers League can participate in the elections to the party convention which have been transferred into the party before the 1st of June 1927.

(4) Election of the Central Executive Committee. We will propose to the party convention the election of a Central Executive Committee of 35, which should be composed on the basis of proportional representation. We are of the opinion that the minority should have 13 members on the Central Executive Committee, even if it does not have the necessary proportional representation in the party convention. The minority also should have the right to nominate its representatives. The majority pledges itself to support and to vote for the candidates of the minority.

The newly elected Central Executive Committee shall, as far as possible, hold a plenum every 3 months, with, however, at least 3 meetings in 1 year. The polcom of the Central Executive Committee should consist of 11 members. It should likewise, as far as possible, be based upon proportional representation by drawing in the most important comrades of the minority. The minority shall have at least 4 members which it can nominate itself.

(5) The Daily Worker should have one leading editor named by the polcom, who should have the full responsibility to the Central Executive Committee for the line and contents of the central organ.

(6) The district committee should be likewise composed on the basis of proportional representation. This should not, however, be carried out in a schematic manner, but rather a small minority should get relatively bigger representation if it has in its ranks able forces.

(7) Comrade Pepper will serve as representative of the party to the Communist International in the Presidium until the newly elected Central Committee will send over a comrade from the United States to replace him immediately after the party convention.

(8) We will propose to the party convention a resolution for the immediate liquidation of all factions and against all factional meetings, against the publication of all faction material, the misuse of the apparatus of the party, or of the auxiliary organizations for factional purposes. We will combat everybody who does not carry out such a resolution of the party convention and who does not execute the resolution of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

(9) This agreement shall be sent to all party units, but not be published in the press.

JAY LOVESTONE,  
BENJ. GITLOW,  
JOHN PEPPER,  
J. P. CAMERON,  
WM. Z. FOSTER,  
WM. W. WEINSTONE,  
A. BROUN,

(Final text, endorsed by Presidium of Executive Committee, Communist International, July 1, 1927)

### RESOLUTION ON THE AMERICAN QUESTION

#### 1. THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND THE WAR DANGER

The United States of America during the last decades has developed into the mightiest imperialist power. In the technique and system of economy it has outstripped Great Britain, particularly during the war and post-war periods. It is also contesting to an ever-greater degree the leading political role of Great Britain. The aggressiveness of American imperialism assumes in a number of cases different, though no less dangerous, forms from those of British imperialism. The task of the Workers (Communist) Party is to form a broad, united front and to intensify the struggle against American imperialism. The policy of the United States in China (Nanking), Mexico, Central and South America, and American oppression of its colonies, form a basis for mobilizing and uniting all the anti-imperialist forces on a broader scale. Within this broad united front the party must strive to establish the leading role of the proletarian elements and combat the liberal illusions about the peaceful role of American imperialism, thus creating the prerequisite for the revolutionary struggle.

In the present stage of the world situation, the preparations for war against the Soviet Union and the imperialist menace to the Chinese revolution constitute the greatest danger for the working class. British imperialism plays a leading role in these war preparations. At the same time, the attitude of the United States toward these conflicts (China), the speeches of its official spokesmen against the Soviet Union (Ambassador Herrick in Paris), its loans to Poland, Finland, etc., show that America will not play a passive role. Despite all its antagonisms with Great Britain, the United States undertakes, to an increasing extent, to back, through open and covert collaboration, the British war preparations against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in order, undoubtedly, at the decisive moment, to support actively Great Britain's war policy, while at the same time it continues to strive for world hegemony. The absolutely necessary struggle against Great Britain's plans to wage war on the Soviet Union and the imperialist intervention in China must therefore always be linked up by the Workers (Communist) Party with the mobilization of the masses for the most energetic fight against the specific role of American imperialism.

In this sense the demonstrations organized by the party in connection with events in China in front of the British Embassy and consulates were right and a proper move. But the writer of some of the editorials in the Daily Worker (May 7 and 8) deviated from this line of action by minimizing the predatory role of American imperialism in China and by representing it one-sidedly only as a tool of British imperialism.

The Workers (Communist) Party must put the question of the recognition of the Soviet Union more energetically in the trade-unions, and in this way also fight against the proimperialist policies of the labor bureaucracy.

In its struggle against American imperialism the Workers (Communist) Party must not overlook the question of the war and post-war debts of the capitalist states of Europe to the United States. Without getting into the leading strings of the petty bourgeois politicians, and without allotting these questions first place, the party must actively support the international revolutionary struggles against the whole system of imperialist peace treaties, the Dawes plan, and the finance policies of the imperialists, from all of which the question of our debts is inseparable.

The attitude of the Workers (Communist) Party can only be for the cancellation of war debts; naturally not for the cancellation of the inter-Allied debts, but of all debts of the last imperialist World War. However, it is not the task of the Workers (Communist) Party to carry on a special, separate struggle under this slogan, but it must combine this question with its general struggle against American imperialism.

All these questions must be utilized by the party to rally the broad masses in defense of the Soviet Union and the Chinese revolution and to sever the masses from the imperialist ideology of the bourgeoisie and the labor bureaucracy. At the same time the party must understand that in view of its numerical weakness it can act as a center of attraction for the broad masses only when it has complete unity.

## 2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REVOLUTIONARY LABOR MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

The peculiar situation in the United States creates greater difficulties for the development of the revolutionary labor movement than in any other industrial country. A great rise is not to be expected in the nearest future. However, strikes and mass struggles of a predominantly economic character are occurring. These struggles are frequently fought with great persistence and bitterness and greatly contribute to the radicalization of broad sections of workers. These struggles (the miners' strikes, the strike in the needle trades, Passaic) are a breach in the class collaboration policy of the trade-union bureaucrats. These class conflicts give our party increased opportunities to attract, by active participation and leadership, increasing sections of workers and to create gradually a basis for a Communist mass party.

American imperialism is still in a position to provide for a large section of the working class a comparatively high standard of living. In comparison with the position of the workers in European capitalist countries, the American working class as a whole still occupies a privileged position. What Engels wrote to Marx in 1858 about the bourgeoisification of the British proletariat may be applied to a certain extent even today to the American working class:

"The English proletariat is actually becoming more and more bourgeois, so much so that it appears that this most bourgeois of all nations evidently wants to bring things about to the point where it will have a bourgeois aristocracy and bourgeois proletariat alongside of the bourgeoisie. Of course, this is to a certain extent natural on the part of a nation exploiting the whole world."

This is one of the most important reasons for the backwardness of the American labor movement.

A considerable stratum of skilled and privileged workers has developed in the United States of America on the basis of its powerful imperialism with gigantic surplus profits. In no other country is the labor aristocracy as numerous as in the United States of America. At the same time, in no other country is the gulf so great as in the United States between the skilled organized native workers who receive high wages and enjoy political rights and the mass of unskilled, unorganized, foreign-born workers who have no political rights.

Not only by means of high wages and a high standard of living, but also through a cunning system of privileges and favoritism (purchase of shares, etc.), imperialism has been able to bribe a considerable section of skilled workers and thus to draw them to its side.

Together with the most venal and corrupt trade-union bureaucracy of the world which has become an integral part of the capitalist apparatus of oppression, the labor aristocracy is still playing a predominating role in the official labor movement. The result of this is: Ideological bourgeoisification of very considerable sections of the whole working class expressed in inadequate class consciousness and in millions of workers following the capitalist parties.

Although with the help of this section of skilled workers, American imperialism hampers the development of the labor movement, still it is not powerful enough to corrupt the entire working class, for its attempts in this direction are subject to the great limitations of completely changed world conditions. The United States is not, as Great Britain formerly was, the workshop of the whole world. Today we have to reckon with the existence of the Soviet Union. In a number of important capitalist countries in Europe the proletarian revolution draws near. The struggle for liberation of the oppressed peoples from the imperialist yoke is developing in Asia. In Latin America opposition to American imperialism is increasing. The rivalry among the imperialist powers for the possibilities of export of capital, for spheres of influence, markets, sources of raw material, and for the domination of strategical positions is becoming ever more sharp; thereby the antagonisms among them increase continually. Along with a whole series of other important factors, these are the main reasons why American imperialism cannot succeed in corrupting the labor aristocracy for decades, as was possible in Great Britain.

American capitalism is still on the upward grade of development. Notwithstanding its growing power, American imperialism as one of the most important component parts of world capitalism is drawn more and more into the antagonisms and crisis of the latter because of its close connection with the capitalist world economy. Although American capitalism is still playing to a certain extent a stabilizing solo within world capitalism, it is nevertheless making imperialist antagonisms more acute. The time is approaching when the crises of world capitalism will also extend to the United States of America, will lower the

standard of living of the privileged sections of the working class as a whole, and will thus lay the foundation for a revolutionary mass movement. We see already, in spite of the corruption of a numerically limited section of the working class through a petty bourgeois standard of living, simultaneously the application of a system of intensive exploitation of the mass of unskilled and semi-skilled, of the foreign-born and Negro workers. In America, too, there are millions of workers living in slums, tenements, and miserable hovels. In those districts under the direct control of the trusts in the coal and steel centers and in the oil districts, the workers are exposed to the oppression and terror of a brutal system of industrial slavery. In no country in the world are workers so rapidly used up as in the United States.

Even if the wages of American workers are higher than in European capitalist countries, the party must realize that the reduction of wages in America to the level of other capitalist countries is not the premise for the development of mass movement. In view of the peculiar historical development of America a relatively small reduction in the standard of living of the American working class can be the signal for big class struggles. This is well known to the employers and their allies—the trade-union bureaucrats. They therefore try to bribe larger sections of the working class through the application of special methods, through the development of a special American system for deceiving the workers, and thereby tie them up with the capitalist system and make them interested in its continuance. They try to destroy the solidarity of the workers through promoting deep divisions in the camp of the working class and thus depriving the latter of its fighting capacity. Under the deceptive slogan "higher strategy of labor" the trade-union leaders and the leading bourgeois economists have developed out of their political, economic, and financial collaboration a general reformist system. They are the advocates of increased production and are the agents of the capitalist rationalization process in the factories. They try to make the working class believe that by investing their savings in labor banks and through purchasing stocks the workers can gain influence—control over, or even ownership of, capitalist industry.

This special form of American reformism openly denies the class struggle and continually subordinates the interests of the working class to those of the employers and their allies—the trade-union bureaucrats. Through spreading dangerous illusions among the workers the class ideology and organization of the latter are weakened. Hitherto the capitalists and the trade-union bureaucrats have succeeded in keeping away the mass of the American proletariat from independent political action. Thereby the trade-union leaders have been able to increase their power over large sections of the organized workers and to bind them with stronger ties to the capitalist system. The Workers Communist Party must ruthlessly expose this so-called "higher strategy of labor" as a deception of the working class and carry on an energetic struggle against this bourgeoisification. For this reason the party should pay the maximum attention to all the manifestations of the ideological corruption of the working class, and particularly to those which made their appearance recently; it must study them in order to be able to launch the most effective struggle against them. This is all the more important because a number of other capitalist countries are adopting, along with the introduction of American technical methods, definite methods of corruption of sections of the working class (welfare schemes, company unions, etc.). In addition to this, the bureaucracy of the Amsterdam International is attempting, by drawing in the conservative American Federation of Labor, to drive the entire trade-union movement still further to the right.

In addition to a broad ideological countercampaign, the party must adopt a number of effective measures for bringing ever-increasing sections of workers into the most intense opposition to the capitalists and the trade-union bureaucrats and for making the proletariat adopt an independent class policy. As such, measures should be considered.

Increased struggles for the establishment of a political mass party of the working class independent of all capitalist parties—of a "labor party"—strengthening at the same time the Workers Communist Party. In order to accelerate the formation of a labor party, not only politically but also organizationally, the party should form local and State committees composed of left wing and progressive trade-unionists; trade-union locals should be won for this work. As soon as a broad enough basis has been created, the party shall take the initiative in the formation of a national committee, which should seek to form a labor party through the calling of a national convention. The labor party, or a forerunner, a "united labor ticket," must have a strong mass basis in the trade-unions. If

this mass basis is not attained, then the Workers Communist Party must itself, as a party, enter the elections campaign. This applies both to local- and national-election campaigns. The party must concentrate great attention on election campaigns. These have a growing importance for awakening of the workers to independent political action and for linking up the party more closely to the masses.

The party must carry on the struggle against the reactionary trade-union bureaucrats for the transformation of the unions into militant organizations, and for broadening their basis through the organization of the unorganized masses. The economic struggles of the workers must be developed, extended, and intensified by the party, in order to increase the class solidarity of the masses.

The party must oppose the reactionary Government as an executive organ of the imperialist trust and finance capital, as an enemy of the working class who in every struggle supports the bourgeoisie with all the means at his disposal, and as an instrument for the oppression of colonial peoples and for fomenting new wars.

In order to expose the antilabor character of the institutions of trade-union capitalism (labor banks, trade-union insurance corporations, etc.), to undermine the confidence of the workers in these institutions, and to free the labor movement from their disintegrating effects, the party must also put forward other specific proposals in accordance with the concrete circumstances. To this category of proposals belong struggle for social legislation administered by the insured. This struggle must be carried on with the understanding that "reforms are byproducts of the revolutionary struggle," for social legislation is not, in itself, an effective weapon against bourgeoisification. At the same time, the party should encourage the development of a powerful, genuine working-class cooperative movement, which must be closely connected with the class struggle of the proletarian movement. All measures must be taken in order to eliminate the influence of the reactionary labor bureaucracy and to place leadership in the hands of Communists and of other reliable left workers.

The freeing of the trade-unions from trade-union capitalism and the complete separation of the trade-unions from the labor banks is an important premise for the development of the trade-unions into fighting organizations. The party must develop concrete methods of struggle in order to develop effective resistance against the linking up of the trade-unions and labor banks. Whenever it appears evident that the mobilization of the masses for resistance to trade-union capitalism in the form of labor banks can be best effected by demanding the transformation of these enterprises into cooperative labor banks under the actual control of, and direction by, the workers, the Communists can bring forward such proposals, relating them with other concrete demands in their agitation, and more effectively counteracting, thereby, the demagogic of the reactionary trade-union leaders. But the party must certainly not allow itself to be carried away by illusions in regard to the possibility of such a transformation of the labor banks, which may be possible only in a few individual cases. It would be a mistake for the party to put these questions in the foreground of its work.

The party must do its utmost to expose labor banks which pretend to be cooperative banks, but which are in reality entirely bound up with the big capitalist banks. Where the possibility exists and where it seems advisable, and after making the economic basis of such institutions thoroughly secure, cooperative banks controlled by the workers themselves can be established in order to use the means at the disposal of the workers for strengthening the material basis of the labor movement. Under no circumstances can money raised in this manner be used for antiproletarian aims—it must rather be used for building up of a powerful workers' cooperative movement and for other purposes in the interest of the working class, as, for example, granting loans to the Soviet Union.

The most important weapon in the struggle against the bourgeoisification of the working class is the strengthening of the Communist Party. With the greatest energy the party must overcome the existing difficulties. The division of the working class into native, foreign-born, and Negro workers makes great demands for increased activity among the Negroes. Work among foreign-born workers must also be increased. But the most important task in the present stage for the development of a strong party consists in drawing thousands of native-born workers into the party in order to bring a fundamental change

into its composition and to establish in this way a closer connection with the decisive sections of the American working class.

The presidium recognizes that despite great objective difficulties, the party has recently made important progress in many fields of activities.

### 3. TRADE-UNION WORK

In the trade-union field the party has achieved quite a number of successes expressed in the increasing influence of the left wing in important unions (the miners' union and needle trades) and in initiating and leading big strikes. The increasing influence of the party and of the left wing has called forth an offensive of the corrupt trade-union bureaucracy as a result of which there are made far-reaching demands on the tactical adroitness of the Workers Communist Party.

The central problem facing the party in its struggle against the offensive of the trade-union bureaucrats and in its efforts to increase its influence is the development of a broad left wing within the trade-unions in which the party must be driving and leading force for the revolutionizing of the American labor movement. Therefore the party, in the opinion of the leading comrades of all groups, must support the Trade Union Educational League to a much greater extent than hitherto. The Trade Union Educational League, its industrial and local sections, must be built up without delay under the most varied forms and names. Attention must be paid to see to it that these organizations and contacts do not comprise only party members and close sympathizers, but also all left wing and genuine progressive elements who struggle against the reactionary bureaucracy and who want to transform the trade-unions into organs of struggle against the capitalists. In accordance with this line, the program of the Trade Union Educational League must be on a broad basis. The Trade Union Educational League must advocate the organization of the unorganized, the democratization of the trade-unions, the amalgamation of the craft unions into powerful industrial unions, the formation of a labor party, and an aggressive struggle against the capitalists. All organizations built on this basis should serve as instruments for the development and organization of still larger opposition movement beyond the confines of the Trade Union Educational League. The party must give the most active support to the organ of the Trade Union Educational League, Labor Unity. The paper itself must be placed on a broader basis; all sections of the left-wing movement should find in it an expression; more nonparty workers must be attracted to it and its editorial staff reconstituted accordingly. Thus only can the Trade Union Educational League become the firm bridge between the party and the broad oppositional movements of the working class.

The party and the Trade Union Educational League must make contacts with all such progressive elements who are prepared to join in a united front with the left wing to fight against the policies of the reactionaries. Every opportunity should be taken advantage of in order to make agreements with these elements with a view toward conducting joint struggles for specific issues. These united-front movements and all differences and splits in the ranks of the trade-union bureaucracy must be utilized in order to strengthen the basis for the left wing and the position of the party. The party must combat every illusion about the truly independent role of the progressives and even when in joint actions with them show up and criticize their weaknesses and vacillations, in order to advance and to develop the leading role of the party and the Trade Union Educational League. With special intensity must the struggle against such black reactionaries be carried on when, for expediency, they pose as progressives in certain situations, and through their "support" of the left wing only compromise the latter. Communists must participate actively in every struggle and take advantage of every opportunity to occupy leading offices in the trade-unions. The struggle for these offices should never degenerate into an unprincipled scramble.

Along with the development of the Trade Union Educational League and closely related to this question there is another problem facing the party; the organization of the unorganized. This task is twofold: (1) The strengthening of existing trade-unions; and (2) the establishment of new organizations where no organizations of the American Federation of Labor exist or where the existing organizations stubbornly resist the organization of workers despite the fact that there is a possibility of conducting struggles against the employers. The significance of the strengthening of the existing organizations of the American Federation of Labor consists especially in the fact that through the streaming in of

additional hundreds of thousands and millions of workers into these organizations the basis for the revolutionary work of the party and of the Trade Union Educational League becomes extended, the struggle against the reactionary bureaucracy and be carried on with greater possibilities of success and the party through this work secures closer contact with the native sections of workers. In order to maintain and strengthen these contacts, the Trade Union Educational League must avoid any kind of rigid organizational forms, adapt itself to the special conditions in the various trade-unions and industries in order to prevent even in the most intense struggle against the trade-union bureaucracy a split of the trade-unions.

The party should not limit itself only to the work in the existing trade unions. The reactionary policies of the bureaucracy of those who, in many instances, refuse to organize workers, and the increasing will of the unorganized masses to struggle, demand that the party, after examining all the circumstances, and exhausting all possibilities to force the American Federation of Labor to organize the unorganized, especially in connection with definite struggles against the employers, should pursue with the greatest energy the task of organizing the unorganized. Having founded such new organizations, every effort must be made to link these up with the existing trade unions and at the same time to insist on the right of the workers themselves to administer the unions. Wherever mass expulsions or expulsions of entire organizations by the trade-union bureaucrats take place, the expelled workers or organizations must hold firmly together and continue to struggle for the unity of the organization on the basis of the protection of the interests of the workers. In all cases the formation of new organizations must be very carefully planned and prepared and be determined by the concrete circumstances of each particular case. The struggle against the bureaucrats must never cease for fear of their splitting measures but the forms of the struggle must be adapted to the special conditions.

In order to carry on our work more successfully in the trade unions and to ensure the leading role of the party in this work, the party must give serious consideration to a number of deviations which have taken place recently. Leading comrades in the needle trades (Wortis, Zimmerman, etc.) have on a number of occasions made right deviations in the execution of the policy, thus hampering the struggle of the workers. They did not develop sufficiently clear and decisive leadership in the mass struggles of these workers. The campaign for amalgamating existing organizations was not sufficiently energetic, indicating a craft attitude to these organizational questions. They did not carry on a sufficiently sharp struggle particularly during the strike against the reactionary bureaucrats. In various instances they did not carry out party decisions. The party must struggle against such deviations still more intensely in the future and see to it that these comrades maintain correct Communist policy.

Other deviations manifested themselves in the case of Comrade W. F. Dunne, who sized up the possibility of the struggle of the workers in a pessimistic manner and through such estimations arrived at false conclusions. Among such deviations are proposals imposing limitations on the leading role of the Trade Union Educational League in certain cases and intending to take the initiative out of the hands of the Trade Union Educational League. Comrade Dunne has also in an article in the Daily Worker of March 24, 1927, made the impermissible attempt to differentiate between the reactionary Green and the Reactionary Woll, both leaders of the American Federation of Labor, in favor of Green.

On the other hand, Comrade J. Zack argues in the magazine of the Daily Worker of May 28, 1927, that further work in the ranks of the American Federation of Labor signifies the abandonment of real struggle, the subjection of Communists to the bureaucracy of the American Federation of Labor, the degeneration of the left wing "if not of our party itself." This conception that activities of Communists in workers' organizations under reactionary leadership presupposes the abandonment of real militancy or, in other words, a move to the right on the part of the Communists, must be rejected as completely false. Communists struggle against the attempts of the bureaucrats to split the union. Communists reject the splitting of the trade unions since this leads to the isolation of the party from the masses and diminishes their capacity to fight. The Presidium, however, records that generally the work of Comrade Zack within the left wing, and especially his criticism of right deviations were correct. Furthermore the Presidium points out that Comrades Foster and Weinstein fought those conceptions and that between them and the majority of the Polcom committee no difference exists on these points.

Further mistakes made in the party were the original opinions of leading comrades in support of the election of Dennis Batt as president of the Detroit Federation of Labor as well as a proposal of the political committee that a joint committee of the progressives of the miners union, of the joint boards of the furriers, and cloakmakers' unions, and of the general strike committee of the textile workers of Passaic be formed to carry on the struggle against the entire American Federation of Labor bureaucracy. This policy would, under the given conditions, have given the bureaucracy the pretext to split the trade unions and thus create the danger of isolation. The political committee recognized these errors and corrected them of its own accord.

The party must learn from these deviations and errors, must struggle against them, overcome them, and avoid their recurrence. Those comrades active and influential in the trade-unions must be drawn more into active party work than hitherto, and especially into the work of the leading committees, thus achieving simultaneously the unification of the leadership of the trade-union work by the party. The entire party membership must regard the work in the trade-unions as the most important task of the party.

#### 4. THE INNER PARTY SITUATION

The objective difficulties, the weakness of the Workers Communist Party and its inadequate contact with the masses of the native works, are factors complicating the inner situation of the Workers (Communist) Party. An insufficiently strong party life, as the result of an insufficient mass basis, the inadequate contact of many members of the former language groups with the specific problems of the class struggle in the United States, favor the development of groups and factional struggles, the existence and intensity of which we seek in vain to explain through serious differences of principle.

The inner party situation, the great difficulties which the Workers Communist Party of America has to overcome, the great tasks which it has to solve, demand the greatest exertion of all sections of the party, especially of its leading cadre, for bringing about a concentration of the party forces on the basis of the political policy of the Communist International and the liquidation of the still existing groups which are outlived now and block the further development of the party.

The VI enlarged plenum of the executive committee of the Communist International very emphatically declared: "That the Comintern demands the complete and unreserved cessation of factional struggle."

It must be placed on record that this demand was not carried out seriously enough and that an untenable position of faction formation within the Communist Party still exists; that alongside of the general party meetings each of the existing factions held special meetings only for its supporters, arriving at binding group policies.

The majority of the party executive did not sufficiently understand how to create such a condition of affairs as to bring about an amalgamation with the forces which are today in opposition. Within the ranks of the majority a breach with the Cannon group took place and the Weinstone group also split off from the majority. It is clear that the majority of the political committee followed a too narrow course within the party themselves, essentially contributed to the continued existence of fraction walls. A struggle of the majority of the political committee (Lovestone) against the groups at present in opposition (Foster, Weinstone, Cannon) would be justified if it were a question of anti-Communist comrades who threaten the further development of the party (like Lore). This is not so in the case of Comrades Foster, Weinstone, and Cannon. The decision of the VI enlarged executive of the E. C. C. I. already said:

"The attempt at a struggle against Comrade Foster and those of his comrades supporting him who on their part desist from the factional struggle is under no circumstances permissible."

This decision was inspired by the endeavor to bring about the joint work of all valuable forces and to gradually equalize the existing differences for the joint solution of all tasks. Today more than ever before—after the death of Comrade Ruthenberg and in a much more complicated situation—is this necessary. Therefore the majority of the political committee must recognize the necessity to do their utmost to bring about the closest collaboration with the Foster group and with the Weinstone-Cannon group, in order to attain complete fusion of the groups of the party convention. Nonrecognition signifies the revival of the faction struggle and signifies in the last analysis the degeneration of the faction into cliques and the creation of a party crisis.

The opposition groups must cease their factional methods. They must endeavor by their attitude to facilitate unity with the majority of the political committee before and at the party convention. All proposals, all criticism of the party work and its leadership must be made in this spirit.

During the work of the American Commission it became clear that the differences regarding the important political questions have recently been much reduced. This provides today a basis for a number of decisions which derive from this welcome political fact certain organizational deductions aimed to impress the whole party with the necessity of a broad collective leadership and collaboration as well as the complete liquidation of the factional struggle.

The Presidium decides:

1. The party convention should take place in the end of August 1927 in view of the delay caused by the work of the American Commission.

2. In order to make possible the convention preparations with the least friction there will be formed a "commission for the preparation of the party convention" consisting of six members with voting rights and two candidates (three of the majority and three of the opposition) under the chairmanship of a neutral comrade. As deputy chairman of the Commission Comrades Lovestone and Foster will function. The Commission has the right to arrive at binding decisions on all questions pertaining to the organizational and political preparation of the party convention. The Commission will also have the right to arrive at decisions and questions of mandate disputes in connection with the delegates to the party convention. The election of delegates for the party convention is to be on the proportional representation system.

3. The normalization and democratization of the party life demand that the party convention after an objective consideration of all important questions elect a broad party executive into which a number of additional and proletarian elements should be drawn in. For the minority at the party convention important representation must be secured both on the Central Committee and in the political committee.

4. In order to demonstrate before the whole party the necessity of collaboration and merger of the existing groups Comrades Lovestone and Foster shall function as secretaries of the party until the party convention and Comrades Foster and Gitlow shall function as secretaries of the trade-union department until the party convention. Further changes in the composition of the leading bodies (Central Committee and political committee) are rejected as inexpedient before the party convention. The composition of the Central Executive Committee is left to the decision of the party convention. It is recommended to the party convention to make a decision that the newly elected Central Committee is to set up immediately a collective secretariat of three comrades, one of whom should be a representative of the minority. It is recommended, in any event, to elect Comrades Lovestone and Foster as secretaries.

5. The Presidium thinks it advisable that the party convention discuss and decide the question of the expediency of transferring the seat of the Central Committee.

---

#### **AGREEMENT FOR THE CARRYING OUT OF THE RESOLUTION ON THE AMERICAN QUESTION ADOPTED BY THE PRESIDIUM OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMINTERN**

We declare that the unity of the Workers (Communist) Party is now more than ever an imperative necessity. The international situation, the ever-increasing war danger, the increasing attacks of the Government and the reactionary trade-union bureaucracy demand the consolidation of all the forces of the party for the fulfillment of the great tasks which are before the party.

The unity of the party can be achieved only through the liquidation of the existing groups and factions, the cessation of the factional struggle, and the amalgamation of the party into one unified whole. We pledge ourselves to work in this direction with all our power and without any reservation.

The first and most important prerequisite for the merging of all the factions in the coming nearer and the unification of the two main historical streams in the party which until now have stood most sharply against each other: the majority of the Polburo and the group of Comrade Foster. We pledge ourselves to convince the entire party of the need of such a step and to avoid any actions which would hinder this development.

At the same time we will make every effort in order to bring about a complete merger with the Weinstein-Cannon group, also. This group, likewise, must

work with all its power for the accomplishment of unity between the majority of the Polecom and the group of Comrade Foster, with the aim to merge itself also with the other groups. Against the Cannon-Weinstone group there should be no struggle carried on any more than against the other groups. We are of the opinion that the leading forces of all three groups can work together as they contain in their ranks complementary forces.

We pledge ourselves jointly to carry out the following measures.

(1) The committee for the preparation of the party convention shall consist of the following comrades.

*Majority of Polecom.*—Members, Lovestone, Gitlow, Bedacht; candidate, Minor or Puro.

*Opposition.*—Foster, Bittleman, Cannon; candidate, Weinstone.

(2) The preconvention discussion shall be conducted on the basis of the resolution of the Presidium of the Communist International. We shall strive to prepare joint resolutions on any further questions. We will seek to obtain the majority of the party convention only within these limits. In accordance with the instruction of the Executive Committee of the Communist International there will be no organizational changes or removals of the party workers in the pre-convention period. The changes made in the district committee of New York in the absence of Comrade Weinstone shall be reversed and the former members of the district committee shall be reinstated in their functions.

(3) The elections to the party convention shall be carried out on basis of proportional representation from the nuclei up till the election of party delegates to the national convention from the district convention. The elections from the nuclei to the city or district conventions commence on August 5. District conventions shall be held not later than August 21. The national convention shall be held on August 31. For each five members or major fraction thereof there shall be elected one delegate. Shop and street nuclei shall have the same basis for representation. For each 200 paid-up members there shall be one delegate to the national convention. The delegates shall be elected by the district conventions. All party units which have paid up their dues until June 1, 1927, have the right to participate in the election. The party units which were founded after June 1, 1927, have not the right to participate in the elections to the party convention. The same applies to party members who enter the party after the first of June 1927.

Members of the Young Workers League shall not be transferred into the party in the preconvention period. Only such members of the Young Workers League can participate in the elections to the party conventions, which have been transferred into the party before the first of June 1927.

(4) Election of the Central Executive Committee. We will propose to the party convention the election of a Central Executive Committee of 35, which should be composed on the basis of proportional representation. We are of the opinion that the minority should have 13 members on the Central Executive Committee, even if it does not have the necessary proportional representation in the party convention. The minority also should have the right to nominate its representatives. The majority pledges itself to support and to vote for the candidates of the minority.

The newly elected Central Executive Committee shall, as far as possible, hold a plenum every 3 months; with, however, at least three meetings in 1 year. The Polecom of the Central Executive Committee should consist of 11 members. It should likewise as far as possible be based upon proportional representation by drawing in the most important comrades of the minority. The minority shall have at least four members which it can nominate itself.

(5) The Daily Worker should have one leading editor named by the Polecom who should have the full responsibility to the Central Executive Committee for the line and contents of the central organ.

(6) The district committee should be likewise composed on the basis of proportional representation. This should not, however, be carried out in a schematic manner but rather a small minority should get relatively bigger representation if it has in its ranks able forces.

(7) Comrade Pepper will serve as representative of the party to the Communist International in the Presidium until the newly elected Central Committee will send over a comrade from the United States to replace him immediately after the party convention.

(8) We will propose to the party convention a resolution for the immediate liquidation of all factions and against all factional meetings, against the publication of all faction material, the misuse of the apparatus of the party or of

the auxiliary organizations for factional purposes. We will combat everybody who does not carry out such a resolution of the party convention and who does not execute the resolution of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

(9) This agreement shall be sent to all party units but not be published in the press.

J. P. CANNON,  
WM. Z. FOSTER,  
WM. W. WEINSTONE,  
JAY LOVESTONE,  
BENJ. GITLOW,  
JOHN PEPPER,  
A. BRAUN,  
INTERNATIONALE COMMUNISTE,  
COMITE, *Executif.*

---

The following paragraph was adopted by the American Subcommission of the Presidium with the purpose to be embodied into the agreement of the American comrades as a statement on the policy followed by the Executive Committee of the Communist International toward the different groups in the American Party:

The Comintern recognizes that in many political questions the Ruthenberg group followed a more correct line in the past than the Foster group. Because of this the Comintern has generally been supporting politically the Ruthenberg group. On the other hand, the Comintern had to protect organizationally the Foster group from the Ruthenberg group. Because the executive had the opinion that the leading group of the majority of the Polcom had not sufficiently understood how to estimate the full significance of the trade-union forces in the party and that Comrade Foster at that time was more correct on many questions of the trade-union tactics, the line of the Comintern has been on the whole for the political support of the Ruthenberg group, and for bringing Foster nearer to the general political line of the Ruthenberg group, at the same time, however, following the course toward the correction of the trade-union line of the Ruthenberg group on the line of Foster through closest cooperation in the party leadership.

BRAUN,

*In the name of subcommission.*

[SEAL]

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

Here is a report [exhibiting] made to the Communist International and Profitern by our trade-union leaders in the needle trades, on the needle trade situation, in Moscow, in 1928. (Three pages submitted.)

Here is a statement by the party on the decision of the Communist International on the American question [exhibiting]. (Ten pages issued March 1926 by C. E. Ruthenberg, general secretary.)

Here is a copy of one of the speeches that I delivered before the Communist International in 1929, on the American party [exhibiting] (May 5, 1929, 25 pages).

Here is another speech I delivered in Moscow before the Executive Committee of the Communist International in 1929 [exhibiting] (10 pages).

Here I have the original and official decision made on the American party question by the Communist International [exhibiting] with the seal of the Communist International, with the signature of the representative of the Communist International who came to the United States, and the decision signed by the following outstanding leaders of the Communist Party who happened to be in Moscow at the time—J. Lovestone, Benjamin Gitlow, John Pepper, J. P. Cannon, William Z. Foster, and William W. Weinstone.

Here [exhibiting] I have a long resolution adopted by the presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on July 1, 1927, on the American question, dealing in detail with all phases of the political and other problems facing the Communist Party of the United States, with the seal of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and the supplemental decision dealing with the most intimate inner political structure of the Communist Party of the United States, signed by Braun, who was chairman of the American Commission in Moscow for the Communist International at that time. (Nineteen pages, stamped with seal of Internationale Communiste—Comité Exécutif.)

Here [exhibiting] is how the Daily Worker would publish decisions of the Communist International on American questions and gives you an idea of their importance to the American Party (Daily Worker, May 20, 1925, p. 3).

Here [exhibiting] is a decision made in 1925 by the Communist International on the American question.

#### RESOLUTION ON THE AMERICAN QUESTION

(From the Daily Worker, May 20, 1925)

1. *General situation.*—American capitalism has temporarily overcome its crisis. Masses of workers, who in the last few years took up the struggle against the arbitrary reduction of their standard of living have been defeated in the tremendous labor struggles and have been subjected to the heaviest yoke. Masses of small farmers, who were in a state of ferment because of the agricultural crisis, have been expropriated. At last the wide open price "scissors" was able to be closed in conformity with all the laws of capital; only in so doing the scissors cut these farmers off from their property. The requirements for the expansion of industrial export could, it is true, not be complied with in an adequate degree, but instead of this, new paths for the export of capital to impoverished Europe were opened. American finance capital has thus not only reached its profit and its power at home but has won the position of the biggest shareholder among the world capitalist power. It now appears more powerful than ever before.

These victories of American capitalism have not been won without paying a big price. Even the Dawes plan, which from the standpoint of Wall Street, appears as a ladder to world monopoly, is likely to draw American capitalism into a policy in which it stands to lose much more than merely its interest in German gold marks. It will involve it more and more deeply in the contradictions and crises of European capitalism and also in the imperialist world arena in conflicts and struggles for markets for interest, for oil, colonies, and power.

Furthermore, class relations in America are developing in a direction menacing to capitalism. The increased pressure of exploitation has forced large masses of workers to the point where class consciousness inevitably awakens even amongst the most politically backward wage slaves. The equality of exploitation which has been greatly extended is changing more and more the former heterogeneity of the American working class. It is true that capitalism is still able to bribe millions of skilled American workers by positions of privilege, but the circle of this privileged class is growing smaller and smaller. Mass unemployment as a permanent social institution and the mass proletarianization of the small farmers for a fruitful ground for the revolutionizing process germinating in the depths. On the whole, the situation of the American working class is at present far from pregnant with revolution; it is different, however, from what it was 10 years ago.

The strengthening of the centralized Government power, which interfere in the most brutal fashion in the every-day struggles of the working class is an important factor in the increasing acuteness of the class struggles and in the acceleration of the crystallization of the class consciousness of the working class. The cessation of immigration from Europe, the influx of hundreds of thousands of ruined proletarianized farmers (farmers of American origin who speak English, possess political rights, and who will offer an energetic resistance to the

exploitation and oppression of the trusts) as unskilled, badly paid workers, into the large towns and industrial centers, represent an important change in the structure of the American proletariat.

It is true that the majority of the American workers does not yet feel any fundamental change in its position. But the developing trend of the position has undergone a fundamental change. This change is only being very slowly and with difficulty to be understood by the masses.

2. The process of the development of political independence of the American workers, which commenced after the imperialist war and has continued under varying forms from year to year, is the political expression of the changed tendency of development of the class situation of the working class. This process, is, however, still moving forward slowly and hesitatingly. This may be explained by various specific American causes and also partly because the American workers have a privileged position in comparison with that of the workers in other countries. In no other capitalist country have the workers to overcome such internal and external obstacles in the beginning on their way to political independence. It is true that the time is already past when the reactionary leadership of the American Federation of Labor could sell the entire vote of the organized workers just as it pleased to the highest bidder of the two capitalist parties. The political position of leadership of the agents of capital at the head of the American Federation of Labor is in part undermined; in part paralyzed by the anticapitalist sentiments of the masses, but it is far from eliminated.

The opposition of masses of organized workers to the continuance of their political bondage to the capitalists originally became apparent in various indefinite forms (for instance in a section of the organizations affiliated to the Communist Peoples Party of America, here and there in the labor unions, etc.). However, it was clearer and more definite in the farmer-labor movement, which led in 1923 to the foundation of farmer-labor parties in many States, and rallied considerable masses around its standard. The Communist Workers Party played, as we know, an effective part in this movement and for a certain period even set the pace in it.

Prior to the last Presidential election, however, the petty bourgeois liberal opposition movement led by La Follette came to the forefront and irresistably captured the mass sentiment of the semiconscious, anticapitalistically inclined workers and farmers.

3. The La Follette movement as a genuine petty bourgeois phenomenon was of a double nature: On the one hand, it was an objective symptom of the disorganization in the camp of the bourgeoisie. On the other hand, in the prevailing crisis of American capitalism, its objective purpose was the support of capital: to divert as a political safety valve the awakening class consciousness of the proletariat from consolidation of its independent class movement. Gompers understood this and allied himself with La Follette. The semiconscious laboring masses, however, saw in La Follette a standard bearer against big business and followed him blindly, for the Farmer-Labor movement still lacked political independence to a certain degree. The majority of the workers in this movement desired the formation of a labor party, but they did not yet demand an independent proletarian class policy; they rather preferred to accept the guardianship of an opposition party of the petty bourgeoisie. The path of the proletariat can even lead through such false roads in its first steps toward its constitution as a class.

4. *The fight of the Workers Party against La Follette for the Labor Party movement.*—As was to have been expected at the beginning, La Follette determinedly rejected any community of interest with a Farmer-Labor Party to be organized with the collaboration of the Workers Party, and he succeeded in isolating the Communists from the masses in the election campaign. For its part, the Workers Party opposed La Follette just as unflinchingly, even though without the prospects of much success. It must be recognized that in the election La Follette gained an important victory. That does not mean that the tactics of the Workers Party were not correct. They were correct: our party only met with a defeat which was not to be avoided under the given circumstances.

After the defeat a certain confusion became apparent in the ranks of the Workers Party. It seemed to the majority of the central executive committee and many comrades that the La Follette movement had paralyzed any mass movement for a labor party for a long time to come. For a time after the elections it really appeared that even the masses which had previously supported the formation of an independent national Farmer-Labor Party wanted no other party besides that of La Follette. In this situation the majority of the party leadership

of the Workers Party drew the conclusion that the former chief slogan of the party, "For the formation of a Farmer-Labor Party," had to be abandoned as useless, and the party for the time had to concentrate its attention, firstly, on the unity of the fight for immediate concrete demands and upon the immediate strengthening of its own ranks.

Important and very symptomatic phenomena in the La Follette movement have already proved that this conclusion was incorrect. At the first opportunity in which a decision upon the formation of a La Follette party was to be arrived at, at the conference of the Communist Peoples Party of America (the most important organization in this movement), the adherents of the new party split on the question of the form of organization. Whether the party should be built up on individual membership—as La Follette demanded—or on a basis of collective affiliation. La Follette feels a very comprehensive fear of the preponderance of powerful labor organizations in his party, but these latter are not inclined to make a renunciation of their influence through the bylaws. This struggle as to the form of the organization is, of course, an expression of the class differences and antagonisms in the La Follette movement. Immediately after this split of the conference of the Communist Peoples Party of America, the executive of the Socialist Party came out into the open with the slogan "For the formation of a labor party" with collective affiliations. The Socialist Party was also up to now one of the pillars of the La Follette movement, and since now it is against the La Follette party on this question, this is of much more significance than the former platonic play of the Socialist Party with the labor party slogan. Numerically this reformist party is now very small, but it has considerable ideological influence amongst the trade-union officials.

In view of these facts there can scarcely be any doubt that in the near future the problem of the labor party will even more than before be an actual, even the most important political, question on the agenda of many trade-unions and other labor organizations. The minority of the Central Executive Committee of the Workers Party was right in having confidence in the vitality and future of the labor-party movement. The Workers Party must now do its utmost to further this movement.

5. *Tactics in the fight for a labor party.*—Not the rejection of a struggle for the labor party but an adjustment and further development of our tactics in this struggle are called for by the present situation in America. Our slogan itself should not be revised insofar that we no longer agitate for a farmer-labor party but only for a labor party, since in the changed conditions the premises for the formation of a joint party of workers and small farmers are lacking.

The Communists need not demand nor even expect that the labor party will immediately be a revolutionary, radical party of workers in which the Communists will have to take the lead. In this respect the slogan has been put somewhat too narrowly by the minority of the Central Executive Committee. The Communists should clearly realize that the formation of a labor party signifies for the affiliated workers only the beginning of their political emancipation and of the development of their class consciousness. It is very possible that in America at first there will be for a time at the head of the labor party similar reformist labor traitors to those in England or even worse. Nevertheless, the formation of such a party may for a time represent a definite step forward in the American labor movement, and the Communist Party is obliged to participate in this party if only the latter permit in a sufficient degree freedom of criticism and agitation by the affiliated organizations.

Why must the Communists act thus? Because it is their task to remain in closest contact with the masses in order to influence the latter continually in a revolutionary sense. However, mere agitation and propaganda even at best is not sufficient for the revolutionary influencing of the masses. For this purpose the masses require their own revolutionary experience. They can obtain essential elements of this experience in the labor party, even though the latter be directed by reformists. In that case the masses, after their disappointments, will learn to know the treasonable role of the petty bourgeois reformists, and that is very important. Furthermore, they will gain valuable experience in the independent political organization of the working class.

The ideas of class and class consciousness are to be inculcated as deeply as possible in the masses of the American working class by the preparatory campaign of the Communists for the formation of a labor party. This is not to be done abstractly, for it would not succeed in this manner, but in immediate connection with the most urgent everyday demands of the workers. The Communists are to induce the working masses to present these demands to the

reformists and to the leaders of the La Follette organizations and to call upon them for joint action with the Workers Party. Should they accept or reject such proposals, sooner or later the traitors will expose themselves. After every such instance the masses of workers will, however, more and more clearly realize the necessity of an independent class party of their own. And if they do not yet recognize the Communist Party as this class party, they will still feel that the slogan of a labor party is the consequence of all their everyday demands, and thus this slogan gains vital mass power.

This fight will require persevering energy and much patience. It would be a mistake for us to begin too prematurely with the organizational measures for the formation of the labor party. This could only give the La Follette crowd a trump card in their fight against the labor-party movement and aid them to reconsolidate their own ranks. We, however, should, on the contrary, drive an ever-deeper wedge into the La Follette movement. Of course, the entire organized mass of workers will not join upon the formation of such a party, but at best only a section.

But the conditions for the successful formation are not ripe as long as there is not a firm basis of trade-union support. The majority of the Central Executive Committee was absolutely right in emphasizing this point. If the Workers Party were merely to be combined with the organizations sympathizing with it, no Labor Party could be formed with this combination.

It may be that the mass support for the idea of the Labor Party will reveal itself so strongly in some cities and even in some States that organizational measures can be taken without further States, that organizationally measures can be taken without further hesitation. The formation of the national Labor Party should be advised against until at least 500,000 organized workers are definitely won over to it.

After the formation of the Labor Party, what the executive emphasized a year ago should be kept in mind, that it is not advisable to endeavor to split off a left wing from the Labor Party as soon as possible in order to transform this split-off section into a mass Communist Party. We must rather endeavor to win increasing masses in the Labor Party for the revolutionary point of view and let this left wing grow within the Labor Party, and at the same time to take the most advanced and revolutionary elements into the Workers Party. This policy is to be observed both prior to the formation of the Labor Party and subsequently.

#### 6. STRENGTHENING AND CONSOLIDATION OF THE WORKERS PARTY

The fight for the formation of the Labor Party in no way excludes propaganda and recruiting activities for the winning and training of new members for the Workers Party. On the contrary, this work should be carried out simultaneously with the utmost intensity. The role of the Workers Party as the Communist Party of the country should neither be hidden nor diminished.

As the Workers Party is at present constituted, it is still altogether too weak to collaborate with sufficient effectiveness in the proletarian mass movement of this great country. This natural weakness was particularly evident in its election campaign. As long as the Workers Party does not at least double its membership (and especially increase manifold the number of its American members) it cannot be said that it fulfills the requirements of an American (legal) Communist Party. Under no circumstances should it underestimate in any way the importance of such "minor" tasks as the circulation of the Daily Worker and the establishment of new organs, the development of the Workers Monthly, the publication and distribution of good propaganda literature, the organization of party schools, recruiting weeks, etc.

The organizations structure of the party still lacks to a considerable extent the necessary cohesion. This is to be improved primarily by systematic, thorough concentration of the party members of all the different nationalities in centralized organizations. The formation of international branches and factory nuclei is therefore on this account the most urgent organizational task of the party.

#### 7. COMMUNIST TRADE-UNION WORK

In America the regular work of party members in the trade unions must be considered now as the fundamental work on which depends the success of the party in most of the other fields, and especially in the struggle for a labor party. Therefore, any tendency to neglect or minimize the importance of this work

must be energetically combated. In every single trade-union organization party members must be organized into the Communist faction and must act unitedly on every question. These factions gets their instructions from the party and work under its control. Communist factions must take an active and energetic part in all mass economic struggles.

The party must give energetic support to the Trade Union Educational League and do its utmost to develop and extend it. Efforts must be made to convert the Trade Union Educational League into a great opposition movement of the left bloc. All attempts of the reactionary trade-union bureaucracy to isolate the Trade Union Educational League to undermine its influence in the trade unions and to limit the membership to Communists and their most ardent sympathizers must be energetically resisted.

#### 8. PARTY WORK IN THE OTHER FIELDS

Although the party is at this time not to propagate the formation of a common party of workers and farmers, it must not only work among the agricultural laborers but must at the same time do its utmost to get into contact with and exercise control over the poorest tenant farmers who are in debt; for they are destined to play a very important role in the American revolution as the future allies of the proletariat. Neither does this modification of the main political slogan of the party mean that the party is not to work in the already existing farmer-labor parties. The task of the Communists in the industrial elements as a special wing, which should be drawn at an opportune moment into a labor party and form a bloc with the organizations of the poor farmers.

The party must pay more attention and give more support to the work of the Communist youth. It is, moreover, of the utmost importance for the party to make at least in good earnest a beginning in the work among working women. The women members of the party and nonparty working women are to be drawn into revolutionary work which the party must organize. The existing nonparty proletarian women organizations are not to be done away with but should be made use of for revolutionary work.

#### 9. STRUGGLE AGAINST LORE'S OPPORTUNISM

Lore represents a non-Communist tendency in the Workers Party. Already the decision of the Executive Committee of the Communist International in May 1924 pointed out that Comrade Lore's ideology was the ideology of the Two and a Half International. Lore supported Levi against the Communist International. He misinterpreted the policy of the Communist International on almost every question. He declared that the main task of the Communist Party of Germany in the revolutionary situation of 1923 should have been to prevent the revolution by every possible means. Lore spread the most ridiculous illusions concerning the mission to establish world peace of Ramsay MacDonald. He warned the French Communists against the overthrow of Herriot. He fought against the necessary centralism of the party in the name of the autonomy of the German federation. The ideological struggle against Comrade Lore's tendency is essential for the party.

The executive proposes to the Workers Party to come to a definite decision on the Lore question at its next congress. In any case the executive is of the opinion that the central committee of the party is not the place for such an opportunist.

#### 10. THE FIRM CONSOLIDATION OF COMMUNIST FORCES

The above platform is adopted by the enlarged Executive Committee of the Communist International, has also been approved by the representatives of both groups of the Workers Party.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International discovered errors in the attitudes of both groups which must be rectified.

The Executive Committee is of the definite opinion that fractional conflicts between the two groups must now absolutely cease. Although it may be true that this fractional conflict arose out of real differences, it has nevertheless been of too acute a character on both sides, and at times assumed impermissible forms. The Executive Committee does not object to a concrete and calm discussion being carried on until the party congress, but in the interests of party unity, it demands the unconditional cessation of party warfare.

In particular the Executive Committee must point out that it regards a campaign against Comrade Pepper absolutely uncalled for, all the more since firstly, Comrade Pepper himself has no intention of returning to work in the Workers Party; and, secondly, the Executive Committee desires to use his energies for more important tasks. The Executive Committee knows that Comrade Pepper, during his brief stay in America, performed services for the Workers Party for which he deserves praise. The Executive Committee demands that all personal polemics between two sides should cease.

The Executive Committee regards it absolutely essential that the representatives of the party majority and minority should henceforth conclude a fraternal peace and work in Communist cooperation. The leading comrades are primarily responsible for setting a good example to the other party members in this respect.

The party congress will be held at an early date \* \* \*. All disputed questions which may arise between the two groups in the party central committee in the interval and which cannot be agreed upon are to be settled by a parity commission under the chairmanship of a neutral comrade (representative of the Executive Committee of the Communist International). This commission will also control the actual conduct of the party discussion.

The executive committee is of the opinion that the party congress, in a calm atmosphere, free from all factional passions, should elect the party central committee from among the comrades of both groups. The group which will be in the minority at the party congress must in any case be assured a large representation in the central committee.

Naturally, both the groups, having adopted this platform, must at the party congress actively resist any of the followers of Lore being elected to the central committee.

The Communist International calls in its decision on the American question for unity between the two major groups in our party.

The minority recognizes the need of this unity and pledges its hearty endeavor to establish it.

Such unity, however, cannot be established through a mechanical act. Nor can it be instantly established as an organic unity of the two groups, but it can, and must, be established as unity of action of both groups in the interests of the Communist movement in America, on the basis of the decisions of the Comintern.

To make possible this unity, it is necessary to remove the causes of mutual distrust and suspicion. It is necessary that the practice must cease of exploiting all difficulties and differences developing in the language sections of the party for factional purposes.

The practice must cease of using the Young Workers League as a tool in the factional struggles of the party.

Persecution must cease against members and branches who stood for a political orientation since then approved by the Comintern.

Prejudiced actions against supporters of the pro-labor-party orientation in the party must be rectified.

We, therefore, propose that the parity commission be constituted immediately and shall at once proceed with an investigation and liquidation of all issues of an organizational nature in the factional struggles which have developed since the beginning of the controversy.

We trust that it will succeed in establishing the prerequisites for united action and thus establish the unity desired by the Comintern and needed by our party.

---

#### COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL DECISION IN 1925

Communist International decided under no circumstances should be allowed that majority suppresses Ruthenberg group because—

First. It has finally become clear that Ruthenberg group is more loyal to decisions of Communist International and stands closer to its view.

Second. Because it has received in most important districts the majority or an important minority.

Third. Because Foster group employs excessive mechanical and ultrafactional methods. You should demand as minimum—

First. Ruthenberg group must get not less than 40 percent of Central Executive Committee.

Second. Demand as ultimatum from majority that Ruthenberg retains post of secretary.

Third. Categorically insist upon Lovestone's Central Executive Committee membership.

Fourth. Demand as ultimatum from majority refrain in removals, replacements, and dispersions against factional opponents.

Fifth. Demand retention of Ruthenberg group coeditorship central organ.

Sixth. Demand maximum application parity on all executive organs of party.

If majority does not except the demands then declare that in view of circumstances of elections, unclear who has real majority and that methods of majority raise danger of split and therefore Communist International proposes that now only a temporary parity Central Executive Committee be elected with neutral chairman to call new convention after passions have died down. Those who refuse to submit will be expelled.

I have here [exhibiting] a letter sent out by Jack Stachel on January 24, 1928, from the organization department of the Communist Party to all district organizers, district agitation propaganda departments, district organization secretaries, to C. C. members—that is, to members of the central executive committee—and to secretaries of the language bureaus of the party:

Enclosed you will find a report dealing with the situation of the German party organization, as reported to the Communist International organization department by the Communist International instructor to the German Communist Party. This letter was sent to the American party because it contained many features that are applicable to our party. We believe that this letter is of such great importance and will be of such aid to our party, if our leading comrades will read and digest it, that we have taken the trouble to mimeograph a number of copies for our comrades.

We ask you to read this letter carefully, and if, on the basis of it, you can make some suggestions as to how to improve our own party organization, we will be very glad to receive them from you.

And that is a long letter dealing with the German Communist Party organization and how it became a matter of great concern for the American party—12 pages, dated October 13, 1927.

Here [exhibiting] we have an opinion of Chitaroff, secretary of the Young Communist International, who writes opinions concerning the American party:

**FROM THE CLOSING SPEECH OF COMRADE CHITAROFF, SECRETARY OF THE YOUNG COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, AT THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE YOUNG COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL**

When we examine the other side—our “dear” Comrade Williamson and the comrades who go along with him—then indeed we may recognize their good will, but unfortunately it cannot be denied that these comrades are closely bound up factionally with the Foster group and still remain bound up with it. It do not know how the Foster group will develop. I don't even know exactly what it represents at the present moment—but hitherto it has been in general a right-wing group. In the past it was a group that fought against the line of the Comintern while the Ruthenberg group was much nearer to the Comintern. The past of the Foster group hardly justifies these comrades coming up here and speaking of the “right wing majority” of the party leadership. These are bad league workers. These are unjust actions. The party had indeed made various mistakes, but these mistakes unfortunately do not apply only to the majority.

Then I must say to Comrades Williamson and Don that at this congress they did themselves a disservice in that they attempted to find differences in youth questions and give these differences a factional character, to pick up little things for the sake of group struggle. They have made the charge that in the question of rationalization and in the question of radicalization the majority of the league leadership has taken an outspoken right-wing position. I believe that these are charges dragged in by the hair in order to make factional business. This must not be permitted. Differences must not be brought for the sake of factionalism and in the interests of factional or group struggle.

Here [exhibiting] I have the original instructions sent out by the organization department of the Communist International, by the chief of the organization department of the Communist International, to the Communist Party of the United States, which was dated the 19th of December 1928 and was signed by the chief of the organization department of the Comintern. It says as follows:

The organization department encloses herewith the following matter:

1. A review of the methods of leadership of the nuclei on the part of party committees; a summary of the experience of party instructors; party decisions brought down to the masses.

Then on the organization department it says:

Guidance of work of the factory boys and contact with them by the party committees.

It was translated from the Russian and submitted to our party as a guide to the work of the party.

On April 15, 1926, Ruthenberg sent out to all party sections and language bureaus the decision of the enlarged Executive Committee of the Communist International on the American Communist Party. This has a headline "To the party membership" and says that the decisions of the Communist International should be accepted without reservations—an official declaration of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of America.

Here [exhibiting] are instructions on how to conduct membership recruiting and some recommendations from the Communist International on this matter—four pages, undated, as follows:

The Comintern in its cable of February 9 places the problem as follows:

"Rapid influx of new members raises before party the task of their organization in factory and street nuclei whose activity must be raised, thus drawing them into daily practical party work and organizing for them short party courses and bringing the most capable into party schools. Without such work directed toward meeting the requirements of the new members and keeping them in the party, a considerable part will inevitably withdraw. The recruiting campaign would thus not only prove valueless but would compromise the party in the eyes of the working mass."

I have here [exhibiting] a letter from Bedacht, which is instructive and brings out a number of matters which I dealt with before and proved them. This letter of Max Bedacht of January 25, 1929, reads as follows. I am only reading parts of it:

The following cablegram signed by the secretariat—

that means the secretariat of the Communist Party International:

Wopot—

that was the cable address of the Communist Party—

New York. That Foster confirm decision postponement convention. Secretariat.

This wire came after Foster left, so I took the liberty of sending reply to Piatnitsky as follows: Piatnisky was head of the organization department of the Communist International:

Polcom accepted and executed.

That is political secretariat convention postponed decision.

The Communist International today postponed our date for the convention at that time.

Gitlow, Foster, Lovestone signed the cable. I do not want to make any further comment on this. Then as to point 6 in the letter:

Marcus sent weekly contribution.

Marcus, who was the C. I. representative of the party, got some money to turn over to the party, and sent it to the party.

Engdahl sent the following decision relative to Lenin school-student finances.

And Engdahl was the representative of the Communist Party of America in Moscow at that time.

Owing to absence characteristic traveling expenses Lenin students, forced coming only upon arrival here.

Generally the money was sent directly to us. And then the following:

Browder was along with Foster and asked in the cable regarding the return of Pepper to the United States, we should include the full apportion for Aronberg and Bittelman. Browder and Foster voted against this cable.

And they also mention "Instruct Swift"—that was another name under which Pepper went—"to comply with decision."

Then here is a cable from C. I. confirming holding of the 1925 convention, and material of this kind:

#### DECISION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL ON LABOR BANKS

##### EXTRACT FROM THE RESOLUTION OF THE COMINTERN ON THE AMERICAN QUESTION ENDORSED BY THE PRESIDIUM OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

JULY 1, 1927.

The party must carry on the struggle against the reactionary trade-union bureaucrats, for the transformation of the unions into militant organizations and for broadening their basis through the organization of the unorganized masses. The economic struggles of the workers must be developed, extended, and intensified by the party, in order to increase the class solidarity of the masses.

The party must oppose the reactionary government as an executive organ of the imperialist trust and finance capital, as an enemy of the working class who in every struggle supports the bourgeoisie with all the means at his disposal, and as an instrument for the oppression of colonial peoples, and for fomenting new wars.

In order to expose the antilabor character of the institutions of trade-union capitalism (labor banks, trade-union insurance corporations, etc.) to undermine the confidence of the worker in these institutions, and to free the labor movement from their disintegrating effects, the party must also put forward other specific proposals in accordance with the concrete circumstances. To this category of proposals belong: Struggle for social legislation administered by the insured. This struggle must be carried on with the understanding that "reforms are byproducts of the revolutionary struggle," for social legislation is not in itself an effective weapon against bourgeoisification.

At the same time, the party should encourage the development of a powerful genuine working class cooperative movement which must be closely connected with the class struggle of the proletarian movement. All measures must be taken in order to eliminate the influence of the reactionary labor bureaucracy, and to place leadership in the hands of Communists and of other reliable left workers.

The freeing of the trade-unions from trade-union capitalism and the complete separation of the trade-unions from the labor banks is an important premise for the development of the trade-unions into fighting organizations. The party must develop concrete methods of struggle in order to develop effective resistance against the linking up of the trade-unions and labor banks. Whenever it appears evident that the mobilization of the masses for resistance to trade-union capitalism in the form of labor banks can best be effected by demanding the transformation of these enterprises into cooperative labor banks under the actual control of and direction by the workers, the Communists can bring forward such proposals, relating them with other concrete demands in their agitation and more effectively counteracting thereby, the demagogic of the reactionary trade-union leaders. But the party must certainly not allow itself to be carried away by illusions in regard to the possibility of such a transformation of the labor banks which may be possible only in a few individual cases. It would be a mistake for the party to put these questions in the foreground of its work.

The party must do its utmost to expose labor banks which pretend to be cooperative banks, but which are in reality entirely bound up with the big capitalist banks. Where the possibility exists and where it seems advisable, and after making the economic basis of such institutions thoroughly secure, cooperative banks controlled by the workers themselves can be established in order to use the means at the disposal of the workers for strengthening the material basis of the labor movement. Under no circumstances can money raised in this manner be used for antiproletarian aims—it must rather be used for building up of a powerful workers' cooperative movement, and for other purposes in the interest of the working class, as for example, granting loans to the Soviet Union.

So you can see from this mass of material—

The CHAIRMAN. Right there at that point I would like for our attorney, Mr. Matthews, to go over all that and decide which ones to get photostatic copies of, so that we can turn them over to the Department of Justice or to the district attorney's office, whichever course we decide to pursue.

Mr. STARNES. As I understand, you are going to publish the whole of the exhibits which Mr. Gitlow has presented to the committee and which he has identified in his testimony, and to which he has referred, as an appendix to his testimony?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. But we want to get some character of photostatic copies so that they can be made available to the Department of Justice or direct to the district attorney's office, whichever course we decide to pursue, so that when action is brought against this bunch, they will have this evidence.

Mr. GITLOW. I now want to deal with my own personal relations with Joseph Stalin, because they will graphically describe the manner in which Stalin runs the Comintern and the manner in which he bosses the American Communist Party.

I said my first trip to Moscow was in 1927. In 1927 I had a conference with Stalin in which we discussed the situation in the United States and the questions uppermost in the American party. And Stalin at that time, in the talks I had with Stalin, asked me very many questions concerning the United States. He wanted to know how large the American working class was, what kind of position it held in the general population, what kind of social legislation we enjoyed in the United States, the extent of the party press, the ramifications of our organization in American life, and so forth. He asked me very many detailed questions and then he reached certain conclusions. And the conclusion he reached at that time was that he was of the opinion that the Communist Party of the United States was not facing an immediate revolutionary situation in 1927.

You will recall we were then at the height of our prosperity and, for that reason, the Communist Party of America should work out a detailed system of social legislation, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, the protection of the rights of workers, and so forth, and so on—a complete and detailed system of social legislation. And he said that would be important in the present situation in which the Communist Party finds itself in the United States.

He said, however, in working that out the party should concentrate on building up a powerful press in America. He said the party is in the stage of agitation and propaganda, and the press plays an important role in this field, and he said, in building up the press and propaganda activities of the party, the party would find a good support in the Communist International and the Russian leadership.

He then took up with us the question of the trade-unions and he spoke—

The CHAIRMAN. Before you leave the press: How did he propose that that was to be done? Did he give any details as to how it should be done?

Mr. GITLOW. No; he did not speak of details, but spoke generally, because we took up many matters on that. Details generally are worked out later.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. GITLOW. Then he proposed—we talked about trade-union matters and he insisted that the Communist Party of the United States must gain a root and a base in the trade-unions of the country; that unless the Communist Party of the United States gained such a base, it will never be an effectual force in America. And he said "The Communist International will do everything; the Communist International will insist that the party make progress along these lines."

He also declared that, in his opinion, it was more worthwhile for the Communist Party of the United States to win over trade-union officials, to have trade-union officials become members of the Communist Party, than just the mere rank-and-file workers, because trade-union officials have an influence over large numbers of members and they can be of much more service and value to the movement than can the ordinary rank and file.

In other words, at that time he laid down for us a program of basic work in developing and increasing the influence of the party and, in my opinion at that time, quite a propaganda program for America. That was in 1927, when Stalin gave our leadership of the American Communist Party his fullest support, because we had rendered to Stalin great service in fighting against Trotskyism in America and internationally, because when our delegation came to Moscow in 1927 the main fight was against Trotskyism, and we worked out a plan whereby the Communist Parties—not the Russian Communist Party—would call for the expulsion of Trotsky from the Communist International. The Russians were wondering how to do it, and when we proposed a way out for them they appreciated that very much, and we were at that time on a most friendly basis in our relations with Stalin.

But the next experience with Stalin was under much different circumstances. At that time in the Communist International Bukharin was chairman of the Communist International and, together with Stalin and Tomsky and Rykoff, the outstanding leaders in the Soviet Union and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. But by 1929 the situation changed, and that was to affect the American party very radically.

In 1929 Bukharin and Rykoff and Tomsky were in sharp disagreement with Stalin on the question of the development of the economic life of Russia. Stalin proposed the rapid industrialization of Russia far beyond the means and ability of the Soviet Union, and Bukharin, Rykoff, and Tomsky made certain criticisms of Stalin's program. And since Stalin is a man who cannot stand criticism, they immediately turned Bukharin, Rykoff, and Tomsky over to the right-wingers, opponents of communism, and Stalin used the situation to eliminate Trotsky from leadership and from the Communist International.

Mr. GITLOW. Our leadership in the American Communist Party were considered as supporters of Bukharin. Stalin did not trust our leader-

ship, and it was Stalin who got in touch with Foster to work out a basis for a change in the leadership in the American Communist Party. A letter was sent to the United States to William Z. Foster stating Stalin's views on the question and informing the membership of the American Communist Party that Stalin was to make Foster the leader of the American party. The convention took place at the beginning of 1929—I believe in February 1929. Before the convention opened—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). Do you mean a national convention?

Mr. GRILLOW. Yes, sir; a national convention of the Communist Party. Before that convention the leadership of the American Communist Party registered 90 percent of the delegates to the convention, and Foster had 10 percent of the delegates. In other words, Foster was in a hopeless minority in that particular convention. Nevertheless, we received a cable from the Communist International, the result of Stalin's direct interference in our convention, directing the convention to elect Foster, an outstanding leader of the Communist Party of America.

The cable went further: The cable directed that Lovestone and Bittleman should be removed or deported from America on the orders of Stalin for work in Moscow—to go to work wherever Moscow assigned them; and, third, that the central executive be elected as provided by Stalin, in which a majority would no longer be a majority, but a minority. In addition to that, two representatives of the Communist International were sent to the United States, by the name of Pollitt and Dengel. They immediately tried, by using the authority of the Communist International, to force our leadership to accept the decisions of the Communist International. We refused to accept that decision, and the result was a crisis in the American party. In that convention, which lasted for weeks, finally a cable was received from Stalin directly for Foster. Stalin himself sent the cable to the convention of the American Communist Party, that, in his opinion, he having demanded that a majority of the American Communist Party should be ignored; that the majority must be a majority, only that Lovestone must cease to be an active leader in the American Communist Party, and must come forthwith to Moscow to do whatever work the Communist International assigned to him.

The representatives of the Communist International were insisting on carrying out the original instructions of Stalin. We had meetings that lasted for hours with the representatives of the Communist International, and finally at one of those meetings they declared that the reason the Communist International was taking a position against our leadership was due to the fact that we were considered Bukharinites. We would have to be Stalin worshipers, and would have to be good members allied with supporters of Stalin before we could hope to be leaders of the American party. They had introduced resolutions against Bukharin attacking him for his views, and supporting Stalin. Nevertheless, the representatives insisted on carrying out the C. I. decision. We elected a large delegation of ten to go to Moscow to appeal against the decision of the Communist International. When we arrived in Moscow—there was a number of delegates, Lovestone, Bedacht, and others, 10 altogether—when we arrived in Moscow, or before we left Moscow, we discovered that Stalin had already judged our case, and had secured a resolution from the Communist

Party in Germany attacking us as right-wingers and as people who were not trustworthy in the international Communist movement.

Our affairs in Moscow, in which we appealed the interference of Stalin against the majority of the American Communist Party, was handled by Molotof, who was premier of the Soviet Union at the time having replaced Rykoff, who was taking charge of the Communist International in place of Bukharin who was removed. As a result of the hearing which took place at Moscow, a decision was adopted which charged us with being supporters of Hoover, with being supporters of the bourgeoisie capitalists in America, and of being rotten politicians. In other words, we were charged with every crime under the sun from the Communist viewpoint. We were told that this decision was in our interest, and that we should sign it. This was an interesting thing. When the hearings took place, Stalin was present at the hearing, and Molotof presided at the hearing. They were the two outstanding leaders of the Soviet Government at that time, a powerful world power, governing a country with a population of 160,000,000 people. Yet they considered their absolute control of the American party was so important that they found time to give their consideration to our problems. Molotof was chairman of the commission, and Stalin was present. He delivered the opening speech, and I have here a pamphlet put out containing the speeches of Stalin delivered on that memorable occasion.

We attempted to get an interview with Stalin to take up personally our problems with him, but at that time it was impossible to get such an interview because Stalin's mind was made up. He was going to take charge of the affairs of the American party in such a way that there would never again arise a group that would challenge a decision of the Communist International, or challenge an order which came from them as a result of Stalin's intentions. When the decision was finally made we fought against it and voted against it. Stalin was present at the meeting and delivered a number of speeches. He lost his usual composure and became enraged. In this pamphlet, if you will take the time to read it, you will notice that he deals particularly with my opposition to him. When I insisted on standing on my convictions, I told Stalin at the time that it was a decision which would brand me as a political crook before the American people, and that it would be impossible for me to admit such a crime before the American people; that I thought his decision would be detrimental to the interests of the Communist Party in America, and that when I went back to the United States I would fight against the decision. I voted against it as a member of the presidium and of the executive committee of the Communist International. Stalin speaks as follows in his concluding speech:

What is to be done if the American delegates in the presidium receive only one vote for their declaration, the vote of Comrade Gitlow, while the remaining members of the Presidium uniformly declare themselves against the declaration and the American delegation are in favor of the draft of the commission? Members of the American delegation, do you think that the conscience and convictions of Comrade Gitlow are above the conscience and convictions of the overwhelming majority of the Presidium and of the E. C. C. I.?

When the decision was finally adopted, after the decision was finally adopted, a meeting was held by the executive committee of the Communist International which I attended, and at which Molotov, who is

now the Premier of the Soviet Union, and Commissar of Foreign Affairs, he having replaced Litvinov. He reported on the decision the important organization steps to be taken by the Communist International.

For the first thing, he reported to the executive committee that Comrade Gitlow, a member of the executive committee and of the presidium of the Communist International, be removed from all posts in the international organization because of his opposition to the decision. Then he said that the Communist International shall send a representative to the American party, who shall have full power and complete control over the American party, and that his decisions shall be binding; that he shall be a member of the secretariat, a member of the political committee, and a member of the central executive committee of the party; also, that he shall have veto power over any kind of decision the party might happen to make. Those were the instructions of the representative that the Communist International sent over to America in that crisis. In addition to that he reported that the Communist International had voted \$100,000 to support Stalin's move in the American Communist Party, and that a sum sufficiently large had been set aside to start a new daily paper if the Daily Worker was lost to the Communist International, to give full support to the leaders of the American party who accepted the decision of the Communist International on the American question.

Now, Molotof brought in this decision which was to establish the complete bossism of Stalin over the American Communist movement. A representative was to be sent to America, and those leaders from America in Moscow who supported the Communist International decision were immediately sent back to the United States, but those leaders who opposed the decision were kept in Moscow for weeks in order to give Stalin an opportunity to have a free hand in bringing about a complete reorganization and shift in the party in the United States. That happened in the year 1929. At the same time, Stalin prepared to use every means at his command to discredit the leaders of the American party who were in opposition to him. So he called in Walter Duranty, a correspondent of the New York Times at Moscow at the time, and gave Walter Duranty a story on the American party situation, which was cabled to the New York Times. That was the first information, coming through this indirect channel, that the Communist people or members of the American Communist Party had of what had taken place. At the same time, the party press of the United States, of the Communist Party press in the United States, was instructed to begin what was known as an enlightenment campaign.

I am sorry I have not the issues of the Daily Worker with me here to show you to what extent the Communist press went in vilification and in character assassination in the attempt to discourage those who just a few months before were the outstanding leaders of the Communist movement. As a result of this shift in the Communist Party affairs, as a result of this direct interference of Joseph Stalin in the affairs of our party, and no one else, this occurred. He gave the order. He was the commander in all the moves, and as a result of that Browder became general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States. In other words, Browder was never

elected by the membership of the Communist Party to become the general secretary of the Communist Party in this country, but Browder became general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States because Stalin, in Moscow, after the reorganization of the party took place, wanted it. When the reorganization took place they were more or less sure that Stalin would retain them in the American party. The question as to who should become the general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States was discussed, and at that time Stalin came out in favor of Browder. He said that Browder would carry out orders, that he had a long record of experience and relationship with Browder, and, as a result, Browder became the general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States.

At a later date, when Browder had acted stupidly in executing certain orders from Moscow, some Communist leaders thought they would have an opportunity to remove him from the leadership of the Communist Party. He had prepared to give up the leadership and return to work in Moscow, but again Stalin stepped in for Browder and saved his neck, because Browder would do Stalin's bidding. Browder could never have been the leader but for the interference of Stalin in the United States. That accounts for the change which has taken place in the Communist Party. In other words, it was the rulers of the Soviet Union that made Browder the general secretary of the American Communist Party, and the Soviet Union and the Communist International won the control directly by that interference in the most intimate inner affairs of the Communist Party of America. In that shuffle of the leadership of the party they ignored the majority of the party. They ignored the overwhelming majority of the party, which voted for the former leadership. They had no respect for the majority. That gives you a picture of the kind of a party the Communist Party in the United States is today.

I want to say that my break with communism was not an easy one, because I was firmly convinced and accepted the tenets of communism, and felt that they would be in the interest of building a better world. In the United States, and throughout the world, I believed that the message advocated by the Russians would help us to achieve that end. So it came as a blow. I realized that in America Americans have the right to develop the tactics and policies of the party here. Anyone who is close to American conditions, and knows the condition of the American Communist Party, knows that it can never be a legitimate American Communist Party, but that it would be only baggage for the Russian Communist Party. Unless the Communist Party is developed about American conditions, is rooted in American soil, and developed by its own American leadership, it can never accomplish such a big task as overturning the whole political and social structure of the country.

After that, of course, I broke with the whole philosophy of communism. That was a process which took a much longer time. This indicates that the American Communist Party today, as never before, is completely dominated as a part and parcel of the baggage of Stalin's political intrigues and machinations in the United States and throughout the world.

Mr. THOMAS. Reverting to your statement about the election of Browder, will you tell the committee what mechanics were used, or how he was elected without going through the form of an election?

Mr. GITLOW. I will tell you that the mechanics were very simple. The executive committee of the Communist International held a meeting where the question of who should be the general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States was considered, and the decision was that Browder should be the general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States. The decision was handed down, and the gentleman who had become the representative of the Communist International was given it; they accepted the decision, and Browder became the general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States. I want to say that since Browder's election they have a further system of control that has been pursued in the Communist Party in the United States, and it is true of other Communist parties through the Communist International; that is, the matter of the development of departments of the party, like the political department, the agitation and propaganda departments, and so forth. They handle all the important matters that come up to the party for decision. They rule the party, and they direct how the party shall carry out certain steps in campaigns, and as to policies. Browder is at the mercy of the Comintern representative in the departments of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. In other words, Browder today is nothing more than a puppet?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir; Stalin pulls the strings and Browder does the dance.

Mr. VOORHIS. You cannot give the names of those people at the present time?

Mr. GITLOW. No, sir.

Mr. MASON. In my opinion, your testimony completely discredits the testimony that Mr. Browder presented to this committee. It absolutely contradicts that testimony. I feel, therefore, that you have rendered a distinct and important service to this Nation, or to the people of the Nation, in giving this testimony. Further than that, it seems to me that you have completely presented an iron-bound case to prove that the Communist Party in the United States is nothing but an agent of the Comintern, and because of that is indirectly an agent of the Soviet Government, and should be regarded as such in this country.

Mr. GITLOW. Absolutely; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an ample law covering that today under which they could be made criminally liable.

Mr. STARNES. While you were the general secretary of the party, or prior to the time when Browder was made general secretary, did you receive propaganda from foreign countries seeking to change public opinion in this country to such an extent as to change our form of government?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, we continuously receive such propaganda from the Communist International.

Mr. STARNES. From what sources?

Mr. GITLOW. The Communist International, in handling the situations, laid down a general line of propaganda, what should be followed. In the propaganda work, we considered the propaganda and that was transmitted to Moscow, and in Moscow there was a special department known as the agitation and propaganda department, called the Agit-Prop, for short, and there the propaganda activities were

reviewed and analyzed, and, then, whatever applied to certain situations was sent back and we received it.

Mr. STARNES. Did you receive printed matter as propaganda from the Communist International and from the Soviet Union for distribution in this country?

Mr. GITLOW. The only printed matter we got from the Soviet Union in large bulk were the Russian publications of the Communist Party, the books and pamphlets printed in the Communist International and shipped here. Sometimes they would print manifestoes and pamphlets, and we received those.

Then the International Publishers received printed pamphlets and manifestoes which were then printed in English, supplied by the Communist International.

Then the Communist International maintained publishing houses in Australia and Great Britain where communistic propaganda material, books, and pamphlets were printed and shipped in unbound form to the United States and bound here and sold and distributed.

Then important issues in reference to future campaigns were discussed and a general line considered, and we followed that, and printed leaflets and other material were distributed.

Mr. STARNES. Where was the decision made in reference to that?

Mr. GITLOW. Sometimes by ourselves and sometimes by the international organization.

Mr. STARNES. Did you ever receive money from the Soviet Union or from other Communist Party organizations throughout the world for the purpose of assisting you in spreading propaganda?

Mr. GITLOW. I referred to that yesterday, I think, quite fully.

Mr. STARNES. The term, "Agit-Prop" comes from the words "agitation" and "propaganda," I suppose?

Mr. GITLOW. It is a contraction of the two words.

Mr. STARNES. What type of instruction was given in the youth camps during the time you were an active member of the party? What type of cultural training was given those children?

Mr. GITLOW. We gave them general Communist instructions. We talked about the division of the country into classes and the mission of the working class, freeing the world from capitalism. It was the general, fundamental communistic teachings.

Mr. STARNES. Of course, that teaching was leading ultimately to the substitution of communism in America for our representative, constitutional, democratic Government?

Mr. GITLOW. I hoped so at the time.

Mr. STARNES. That was its purpose?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You said this morning, in speaking of the revolution, that there were two things to be considered—first, preparing the soil, and, second, the guidance or control of the policies after the soil has been prepared.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. I presume that would be the cultivation of the crop?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. How was this soil to be prepared for the revolution, by what method?

Mr. GITLOW. By methods of propaganda, agitation, and infiltration of the trade-unions; building up general sympathy and supporting

certain movements at a particular time that may be of benefit to the people.

But the Communist Party were never conspirators in the form that they could set a date for the revolution. They believed that events would come about so that a revolutionary situation would prevail, and then a revolution would break out, and they would take charge of such a situation which arose, and their main object was in the preparation for such a situation, and they would take control.

Mr. STARNES. After the soil was prepared they would simply take it over?

Mr. GITLOW. If we had a revolution in the United States in which the Communists played a leading part, we would follow what the Russians did; we would create a soviet government and establish a so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, and permit only one party to operate in the United States—the Communist Party of America.

Mr. STARNES. You would have a one-party system?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course.

Mr. STARNES. I notice in these cablegrams and letters and publications that this question of alphabetical soup is nothing new. Is that correct?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. That is, so far as the use of alphabetical terms is concerned?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. To designate agencies?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. How long have you known Earl Browder?

Mr. GITLOW. The first time I met Earl Browder was when I first came out of prison in 1922. I met Earl Browder at a meeting of the Central Executive Committee of the Underground Communist Party at that time.

Mr. STARNES. Was he known during that time as Ward or Dixon?

Mr. GITLOW. I forget; at that period every Communist had his legal name and an underground party name.

Mr. STARNES. Give us some of his party names by which you knew him?

Mr. GITLOW. I do not remember what his underground name was.

Mr. STARNES. To refresh your recollection, I think he testified that he was known as Ward in his writings, and that he was also known as Dixon. Did you know him by either one of those names?

Mr. GITLOW. I remember the name of Dixon, but whether it applied to Browder I could not say.

Mr. STARNES. And the name Marks?

Mr. GITLOW. I could not recall.

Mr. STARNES. Nor Stuart?

Mr. GITLOW. I could not say.

Mr. STARNES. Nor Pressenberg? You could not say about that?

Mr. GITLOW. No.

Mr. VOORHIS. I would like to ask you a couple of questions about trade unions. Somewhere in your testimony, I do not recall just when it was, there was mentioned the success that had been had in the needle trades. When would that be, in the early twenties?

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, no; I think in the trade unions we had our greatest success covering a period from 1925 up to 1929, or 1928, at the end

of 1928, when we split away from the American Federation of Labor, and today I believe the Communists still have considerable power in the needle-trade union.

Mr. VOORHIS. I remember in 1933, at which time Los Angeles was substantially an open-shop city, that there was a strike called by the I. L. G. W. U., for recognition, primarily. It lasted a long time, and there was a lot of community interest in it, and it was finally won.

On the day that the union met and the membership ratified the agreement the T. U. E. L. came out with leaflets, condemning the leadership of the I. L. G. W. U., saying this was a sell-out and for the membership not to accept it.

I may not be right, but my judgment is that had they refused to accept it undoubtedly the strike would have been lost and there is no telling what the result would have been because conditions at that time in the needle trades were very bad.

It seemed to me that that showed an unfortunate point of view on the part of the T. U. E. L. toward successful labor-union activity, in the sense of improving the conditions of the people working there. After that, that policy was changed, as I understand it, to one of penetration, you might call it.

Do you believe that substantially that attitude of the Communists toward successful American trade-union activity in the American sense of the word has been substantially altered?

Mr. GITLOW. I am of opinion that the activities of the Communists in the trade unions is very detrimental to trade unions, even in those situations where they have gained control, particularly in the conduct of strikes, even though they may adopt at the present time a very conservative policy, because you are never sure today what the policy will be in a particular situation.

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes; and the basic attitude toward the labor movement is perhaps comparable to the attitude toward the whole political picture. In other words, the tactic may be pursued, but there is not any more real interest now than there was before in the success of the American labor movement, is there?

Mr. GITLOW. Only so far as it will further the interests of the Communist movement.

I am not acquainted with the situation in Los Angeles. Perhaps the Communists played no part in the victory, but they wanted to get some position of leadership and they utilized the sentiment at that time to undermine the leadership, and they accepted the settlement so that their leaders might get to the top.

Mr. VOORHIS. Exactly. You testified, I believe, that the method of organizing factions in unions is undesirable?

Mr. GITLOW. Absolutely.

Mr. VOORHIS. That is substantially the gathering together of people in the union who belong to the party so they pursue party policies and carry out the program as handed down to them at that time?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. Then it is evident, is it not, that if at any time the interests of a union may clash with the orders of the party, that the orders are paramount, so far as those people are concerned?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Gitlow, you have spent your life, substantially, in trying to better conditions of the ordinary people of the world from whatever standpoint, as you see it, is the best way to do it?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. You still are as eager to do that as you ever were?

Mr. GITLOW. The same as I ever was.

Mr. VOORHIS. If this committee is successful in bringing testimony such as you have brought here, to the attention of the American people it would tend to clarify the atmosphere, would it not, and call the condition to the attention of the people of the country so that they would know what is going on, as nothing else would do?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I think this committee can render service to the people of the United States through the clarification of the general political situation and that it will be able to bring out boldly the things that are being done, so that the general public will understand the true nature of the Nazi and intolerant forces in America and of the Communist Party, and also the work upon which they are engaged and elements that are undigestible in America.

Mr. VOORHIS. Exactly, and fundamentally they are at variance with the basic institutions?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. And also out of your experience has come the conviction that there is not under the present circumstances any real possibility of a real improvement in the lot of the masses of the people.

Mr. GITLOW. I think if we could have a situation where men will speak as a result of their convictions, and they will not speak because they have been instructed to speak in a certain way and maintaining certain positions because they have a whip over them, then that will help in having a democratic interchange of ideas and the operation of our political democracy so as to arrive at certain reforms and other measures, that may greatly improve both the political and economic situations in this country.

I think it will be a very sad situation if the findings of this committee should become the basis for bolstering up a real reactionary situation in the labor drive in the United States.

Mr. VOORHIS. That is exactly the point I was trying to get to, the fact that these facts are brought before the attention of the people with the hope that we can eliminate these forces from the life of our country, and it imposes upon those of us who desire to see improvement in the life of the people of this country an even greater necessity, does it not, for attempting to work for those constructive measures, than was the case before?

Mr. GITLOW. I believe so. I believe there is always room for improvement, and there are many things in America that we have to apply ourselves to bring about a more equitable situation for the great masses of the people of our country.

If we can do that in an atmosphere in which constructive application to the problem can be engaged in, that will be of great benefit.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with what you had to say about not giving any encouragement to the reactionary forces, it is also true, is it not, that when we point out the facts and give labor, for instance, the facts, then it becomes incumbent upon the leadership of the party,

when they are opposed to communism, to let the American people know that they are opposed to it and to take steps to prevent these forces from gaining undue influence within the labor ranks?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I am of the opinion that the development of the Fascist, or what I could call intolerant forces in America, on the one hand, and the activities of the Communists as a foreign agency, on the other hand, has been of the greatest support to reaction in this country, and has so confused the political scene that we cannot constructively apply ourselves to the problems we must meet and solve in this country.

Mr. VOORHIS. So you have two opposing movements, each of which is directed as being against something, with a great deal of the energy of the people expended, on the one hand, in opposing one extreme, and, on the other hand, in opposing the other extreme, instead of doing any constructive work.

Mr. GITLOW. Of course, it would be an ideal situation if when an individual proposes something you would not charge him with being a Communist and, on the other hand, with being a Nazi, but consider his proposals for what they are worth.

The CHAIRMAN. My point is that we have to have the cooperation of these groups themselves, of the liberal groups that have been victimized by Communists and the labor organizations, and all that we can do is to present the facts, and the Government authority has to cooperate if we get the desired results.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned, to meet tomorrow, Saturday, September 9, 1939, at 11 a. m.)



# INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

---

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1939

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 11 a. m., in the caucus room, House Office Building, Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The following members of the committee were present: Messrs. Dies (chairman), Starnes, Voorhis, Mason, and Dempsey.

Also present: Mr. Rhea Whitley, counsel to the committee, and Mr. J. B. Matthews, research director.

## TESTIMONY OF BENJAMIN GITLOW—Resumed

**THE CHAIRMAN.** The committee will come to order, and Mr. Gitlow will resume the stand.

**MR. MATTHEWS.** Mr. Gitlow, I have here a pamphlet entitled "The Twenty-one Conditions of Admission Into the Communist International," by O. Piatnitsky. When Mr. Browder was on the stand he stated categorically that the 21 conditions of admission into the Communist International had never been binding upon the Communist Party of the United States. What would you have to say about the question of whether those conditions were ever considered binding on the Communist Party of the United States?

**MR. GITLOW.** When the Communist International was first organized in 1920 they drew up the basis of admission to the Communist International, and the basis of admission to the Communist International was the famous 21 points. Every party and every organization that sought admission to the Communist International had to accept in advance the 21 points before they were admitted into the Communist International. Party members who refused to accept the 21 points were not granted admission to the Communist International. For example, the American Socialist Party was willing to take up the question of affiliation with the Communist International, but it raised a reservation as to the 21 points, and they were not accepted, and there were other organizations as well. The Communist Party of the United States at the very beginning accepted the 21 points, and the 21 points have been the guiding principle in the Communist work and for the Communist Party in the United States.

**MR. MATTHEWS.** I will read from an editorial which appeared in the Daily Worker, issue of June 1, 1929, page 1. The title of this editorial is "Who Is Against the Comintern?" and from this editorial I read as follows:

Comrades Lovestone and Gitlow in their declaration of May 14 refused to accept the address, or to carry it out, and even went to the length of stating they would actively oppose it. They are thus entering upon a course leading toward an attempt to split the party, a course in violation of the 21 conditions and the statutes of the Comintern.

When Browder was on the stand he also stated that the statutes of the Comintern were not and never had been applicable to the Communist Party of the United States. What would be your answer to that?

Mr. GITLOW. The statutes of the Comintern have always been applicable to the Communist Party of the United States, and if the Communist Party of the United States had made any indication that it had a reservation or refused to accept the statutes of the Communist International, it would have been expelled from the Communist International.

The CHAIRMAN. Right in that connection, the 21 requirements primarily were subserviency to the Comintern?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir. I will read No. 21, as follows:

Members of the party who reject the conditions and theses of the Communist International on principle must be expelled from the party.

That is the twenty-first condition. There are 20 others which have the same general implication. The entire 21 conditions fill only 4 pages, and I think they should be incorporated in the record, inasmuch as the Daily Worker itself states categorically that Lovestone and Gitlow were guilty of violating the 21 conditions, and, also, guilty of violating the statutes of the Comintern.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask Mr. Gitlow in that connection whether those conditions were obligatory upon the individual members of the party as well as on the party.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not only a party matter but an individual matter.

Mr. GITLOW. It is a party matter and an individual matter, binding on both.

The CHAIRMAN. How does it read with reference to the individual member of the party?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The twenty-first condition reads—

Members of the party who reject the conditions and theses of the Communist International on principle, must be expelled from the party.

I ask that the 21 conditions be included in the record, and I also ask that this section of the editorial in the Daily Worker be inserted in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

The Second Congress of the Communist International resolves that the conditions for membership in the Communist International shall be as follows:

"1. The daily propaganda and agitation must bear a truly Communist character and correspond to the program and all the decisions of the Third International. All the organs of the press that are in the hands of the party must be edited by reliable Communists who have proved their loyalty to the cause of the proletarian revolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat should not be spoken of simply as a current hackneyed formula; it should be advocated in such a way that its necessity should be apparent to every rank-and-file working man and woman, each soldier and peasant, and should emanate from the facts of everyday life systematically recorded by our press day after day.

"The periodical and nonperiodical press and all party publishing organizations must be wholly subordinate to the Central Committee of the party, irrespective as to whether the party as a whole, at the given moment, is legal or illegal. That publishing organizations, abusing their autonomy, should pursue a policy that does not completely correspond to the policy of the party, cannot be tolerated.

"In the columns of the newspapers, at public meetings, in the trade-unions, in the cooperative societies—wherever the adherents of the Third International gain access, they must systematically and mercilessly denounce not only the bourgeoisie, but also its assistants, the reformists of every shade.

"2. Every organization desiring to belong to the Communist International must steadily and systematically remove from all responsible posts in the labor movement in the party organization, editorial boards, trade-unions, parliamentary fractions, cooperative societies, municipalities, etc., all reformists and followers of the 'center,' and have them replaced by Communists even at the cost of replacing at the beginning 'experienced' leaders by rank-and-file workingmen.

"3. The class struggle in almost all the countries of Europe and America is entering the phase of civil war. Under such conditions the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois law. They must everywhere create a parallel illegal apparatus, which at the decisive moment could assist the party in performing its duty to the revolution. In all countries where, in consequence of martial law or exceptional laws, the Communists are unable to carry on all their work legally a combination of legal and illegal work is absolutely necessary.

"4. The obligation to spread Communist ideas includes the particular necessity of persistent, systematic propaganda in the army. Wherever such propaganda is forbidden by exceptional laws, it must be carried on illegally. The abandonment of such work would be equivalent to the betrayal of revolutionary duty and is incompatible with membership in the Third International.

"5. It is necessary to carry on systematic and steady agitation in the rural districts. The working class cannot consolidate its victory without the backing of at least part of the agricultural laborers and the poorest peasants, and without having neutralized, by its policy, a part of the rest of the rural population. Communist work in the rural districts is acquiring a predominate importance during the present period. It should be carried on in the main by revolutionary Communist workers of both city and country only, who have connections with the rural districts. To refuse to do this work or to transfer such work to untrustworthy half-reformists is equal to renouncing the proletarian revolution.

"6. Every party that desires to belong to the Third International must expose not only open social patriotism but also the falsity and hypocrisy of social-pacifism; it must systematically demonstrate to the workers that without the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, no international arbitration courts, no disarmament, no 'democratic' reorganization of the League of Nations will save mankind from new imperialist wars.

"7. The parties desiring to belong to the Communist International must recognize the necessity of a complete and absolute rupture with reformism and the policy of the 'center,' and they must carry on propaganda in favor of this rupture among the broadest circles of the party membership. Otherwise a consistent Communist policy is impossible.

"The Communist International unconditionally and peremptorily demands that this split be brought about with the least delay. The Communist International cannot reconcile itself to the fact that such avowed reformists as Turatti, Kautsky, Hilferding, Hillquit, Longuet, MacDonald, Modigliani, and others should be entitled to consider themselves members of the Third International. This would make the Third International resemble, to a considerable degree, the late Second International.

"8. On the question of the colonies and oppressed nationalities an especially distinct and clear line must be taken by the parties in those countries where the bourgeoisie possesses colonies or oppresses their nations. Every party desirous of belonging to the Third International must ruthlessly denounce the methods of 'their own' imperialists in the colonies, supporting, not in words but in deeds, every independence movement in the colonies. It should demand the expulsion of their own imperialists from such colonies, and cultivate among the workers of their own country a truly fraternal attitude toward the toiling population of the colonies and oppressed nationalities, and carry on systematic agitation in its own army against every kind of oppression of the colonial population.

"9. Every party that desires to belong to the Communist International must carry on systematic and persistent Communist work in the trade-unions, in

workers' and industrial councils, in the cooperative societies, and in other mass organizations. Within these organizations it is necessary to create Communist groups, which by means of practical and stubborn work must win over the trade-unions, etc., for the cause of communism. These cells should constantly denounce the treachery of the social patriots and the vacillations of the 'center,' at every step. These Communist groups should be completely subordinate to the party as a whole.

"10. Every party that belongs to the Communist International must carry on a stubborn struggle against the Amsterdam "International" of yellow trade-unions. It must persistently propagate among the organized workers the necessity of a rupture with the yellow Amsterdam International. It must give all the support in its power to the incipient international alliance of the "red" trade-unions affiliated to the Communist International.

"11. The parties desiring to belong to the Third International must overhaul the membership of their parliamentary fractions, eliminate all unreliable elements from them, to control these fractions, not only verbally but in reality, to subordinate them to the Central Committee of the party, and demand from every Communist member of parliament that he devote his entire activities to the interests of really revolutionary propaganda and agitation.

"12. Parties belonging to the Communist International must be built up on the principle of democratic centralism. At the present time of acute civil war, the Communist Party will only be able fully to do its duty when it is organized in the most centralized manner, if it has iron discipline, bordering on military discipline, and if the party center is a powerful, authoritative organ with wide powers, possessing the general trust of the party membership.

"13. The Communist parties of those countries where the Communists' activity is legal shall make periodical cleanings (reregistration) of the members of the party organizations, so as to systematically cleanse the party from the petty-bourgeois elements who inevitably attach themselves to it.

"14. Every party that desires to belong to the Communist International must give every possible support to the Soviet Republics in their struggle against all counter-revolutionary forces. The Communist parties should carry on a precise and definite propaganda to induce the workers to refuse to transport munitions of war intended for enemies of the Soviet Republics, carry on legal or illegal propaganda among the troops, which are sent to crush the workers' republics, etc.

"15. The parties which up to the present have retained their old social-democratic programs must in the shortest possible time overhaul these programs and draw up a new Communist program in conformity with the special conditions of their respective countries and in accordance with resolutions of the Communist International. As a rule, the program of every party that belongs to the Communist International must be ratified by the next Congress of the Communist International or by the executive committee. In the event of the executive committee of the Communist International failing to ratify the program of a particular party, that party has the right to appeal to the Congress of the Communist International.

"16. All decisions of the Congresses of the Communist International, as well as the decisions of its executive committee, are binding on all parties affiliated to the Communist International. The Communist International, operating in the midst of most acute civil war, must have a far more centralized form of organization than that of the Second International. At the same time, the Communist International and its executive committee must, of course, in all their activities, take into consideration the diversity of the conditions under which the various parties have to work and fight, and should issue universally binding decisions only on questions on which the passing of such decisions is possible.

"17. In connection with all this, all parties desiring to join the Communist International must change their names. Every party that desires to join the Communist International must bear the name: Communist Party of such-and-such country (section of the Third Communist International). This question as to name is not merely a formal one, but a political one of great importance. The Communist International has declared a decisive war against the entire bourgeois world and all the yellow social-democratic parties. Every rank-and-file worker must clearly understand the difference between the Communist parties and the old official social-democratic or "socialist" parties which have betrayed the cause of the working class.

"18. All the leading party organs of the press in all countries must publish all the chief documents of the executive committee of the Communist International.

"19. All parties belonging to the Communist International, or having made an application to join it, must, in the shortest possible period, but not later than 4 months after the Second Congress of the Communist International, call special party congresses, for the purpose of discussing these obligations. In this connection, the Central Committees must take measures to enable all the local organizations to become acquainted with the decisions of the Second Congress of the Communist International.

"20. The parties that would now like to join the Third International but which have not yet radically changed their former tactics must, before joining, take steps to insure that their central committees and all most important central bodies of the respective parties shall be composed, to the extent of at least two-thirds, of such comrades as even prior to the second congress of the Communist International have openly and definitely declared for joining the Third International. Exceptions may be made with approval of the executive committee of the Third International. The executive committee of the Communist International has also the right to make exceptions in the cases of representatives of the "center" mentioned in point 7.

"21. Members of the party who reject the conditions and theses of the Communist International on principle must be expelled from the party.

"This applies also to the delegates to the special party congresses."

The editorial in the Daily Worker, issue of June 1, 1929, is as follows:

#### Who is against the Comintern?

It is clear from the address itself that opposition existed in the party delegation to the Communist International. Comrades Lovestone and Gitlow in their declaration of May 14 refused to accept the address or to carry it out, and even went to the length of stating they would actively oppose it. They are thus entering upon a course leading toward an attempt to split the party, a course in violation of the 21 conditions and the statutes of the Comintern. In this splitting cause they do not in any way represent the true proletariat spirit of the American party and will find the party membership solidly lined up against them. Comrades Lovestone and Gitlow, on attempts to renew the faction struggle on the basis of opposition to the Communist International, will quickly feel the solid determination of the party, which will tolerate no further faction activities of any kind.

But let there be no mere mechanical acceptance of the Communist International address. Such formal acceptance, without application in life of the line of policy laid down in it, would be barren. The party discussion now opening must take the form of basic self-criticism, of development of inner-party proletarian democracy, which will eliminate all elements of factionalism and mobilize the party for its really basic tasks—internally to combat all traces of opportunism, to struggle against the "right" danger, and externally to mobilize the awakening sections of the working class, who are more and more engaging in struggle against capitalist rationalization and against the danger of war. The party discussion must be made into a keen weapon against all remnants of factionalism as the first steps in real drive against opportunism, which has been deeply imbedded in the American party and which must be burned out in the fires of merciless criticism, and to concentrate the full energies of the party on the practical tasks emphasized in the address.

Therefore it is necessary for all party units forthwith to begin a full, thorough, honest, self-critical, Bolshevik discussion of the address of the Comintern and of the tasks of the party in the light of this address.

The next 2 weeks the party press will especially concentrate upon this discussion, which means a new stage in the forward march of the Communist Party of the United States of America toward becoming a mass party, the leader of the American working class in the struggle against American capitalism.

Form up the ranks of the party for the Comintern, against the splitters or splitting tendencies, no matter from what quarter!

The Communist Party of United States of America is for the Comintern!

Reject and condemn all opposition whatsoever to the Comintern!

For a complete Bolshevik application of the address, which shall infuse the whole party with the Comintern line and completely unify its ranks from top to bottom on the revolutionary line of the Communist International.

For the struggle against factionalism, against opportunism, and for the practical work that will build a mass Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether Mr. Browder on any of his trips to Moscow was personally associated with or conferred with Joseph Stalin?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I cannot say definitely myself, because when I was in Moscow, or at times I happened to be at Moscow, Browder was not in Moscow; but I believe with great certainty that Browder saw Stalin personally on many occasions.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether Mr. Browder was associated with Arthur Ewart, who, I believe, was a member of the German party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. And whether he was associated with him in the United States at any time?

Mr. GITLOW. He was associated with Ewart. He was here in the United States during the convention. When Ewart was a representative of the Communist International he associated with him and talked with him. That I know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You know that he did?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Ewart, I believe, was in prison in South America.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have previously stated that the Communist Party pursued the policy that the end justified the means, and that anything which furthered the interests of the party was considered entirely proper by the party, even actions which constitute a direct violation of law, either Federal or State?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those actions, if they were for the purpose of furthering the party's interest, were considered entirely fit and proper?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you this morning give us some further information concerning the illegal activities of the Communist Party and the secret methods pursued by them?

Mr. GITLOW. For example, it was the general policy of the Communist Party to defy injunctions. When injunctions were issued against labor unions in strikes, we instructed our members in those organizations not to obey the injunctions but to fight against the injunctions. Then, during the invasion of Nicaragua by the United States Government, the party conducted a campaign against American interference in Nicaragua and adopted a certain stamp that should be pasted on all envelopes carrying mail, which gave the party's position in that situation. The Post Office Department of the United States Government informed the party that the use of those stamps was against certain rules of the United States Post Office or the Postal Laws and Regulations. Nevertheless, we took it up in the political committee of our party and made a decision to use the stamps, nevertheless, in defiance of the rules and regulations of the United States Post Office Department. There were many other instances in which that was done. In other words, we always considered whether or not

our defiance of laws or engagement in illegal activities would further the interests of the party. If they did, they would not hesitate to break the law or to engage in illegal activities.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what other type of illegal activities did party members participate generally? There was some testimony at the time Mr. Browder was on the stand concerning the illegal use of passports by a number of party members. Can you give us any information on that subject?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I can give the information, but I think it would be better to put it in a more coherent form and to show how the Communist Party of the United States not only is an agency of the Soviet Government but is also an agency of the secret police, or the OGPU of the Soviet Government, and how the thing operates.

Mr. WHITLEY. If you will do that, but before you start, will you just describe or indicate to the committee the nature of that organization, the OGPU, and where it gets its directions?

Mr. GITLOW. The OGPU is an organization of the secret police or espionage of the Soviet Government, and it is tied up with the military intelligence division of the Soviet Government. The OGPU is active not only inside of Russia, but as military police, just as the Gestapo of Germany, it also has international activities. It is a part of the espionage work of the Soviet Government throughout the world. The Soviet Government maintains a very large staff of the OGPU agents in every country in the world, and the expense of maintaining the OGPU and financing its activities is tremendous. Nevertheless, the Bolshevik leaders are of the opinion that the work of the OGPU is one of the most important branches of the Government, particularly in defense of the Government, because they took the position that to know a thing is to be forewarned and to be prepared. That is the organization which supplies them with information of what is going on in connection with all kinds of diplomatic information, military information, industrial information, and information as to the Communist parties themselves and the personnel in the Communist parties. That organization is the OGPU.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, in carrying on their espionage activities in foreign countries, they are not only spying in them and obtaining information as to the Government of that country and its industries, but, also, they are watching the Communist parties in those countries?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. They performed both of those functions?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, in countries where the Soviet Government had this organization, or espionage organization, they were spying upon the parties in those different countries?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you give us some instance or illustration of how that operates, particularly as it affects the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I can report how, in 1927, when I went to Moscow, and when our leadership was accepted as the leadership of the Communist Party of the United States, I was called in by the Org Department of the Communist International, which was connected with the OGPU, and I was shown there the files on the American party. They turned over to me letters—personal letters—and other

information sent by leaders of the party opposition in America, about their contacts, reports, and so forth. There were voluminous documents of every kind, showing that they had complete files and archives on every detail concerning the American party.

MR. WHITLEY. Will you continue with your discussion of the activities, or illegal activities, of the party?

MR. GITLOW. Yes, sir; I will do that. You must bear in mind that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, of which Stalin is the general secretary, is the actual government of Russia, and that the government departments, councils, and agencies are not actually the Government of Russia but that they execute the rules and orders handed down to them by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. For example, when Stalin had to prepare to initiate the first 5-year plan in Russia that plan was not considered by the soviets of Russia, which are supposed to represent the Government, but it was first taken up in the political committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the plan was worked out by the political committee. After the political committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had worked out the plan, they called what is known in Russia as the plenum of the executive committee of the Russian Communist Party. That was in 1927. That was in 1927, and at that plenum were present the members of the central executive committee of the Russian Communist Party, all the district leaders, or members of the district executive committees, plus the party's important military leaders, in the Army, the Navy, and Air Force of the Soviet Union.

That plenum of the party received the report of the political committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, listened to it, accepted it, and adopted it. After the plenum was over they called the soviets into session, which were supposed to be the Government, in order to give it the appearance that the whole plan was accepted by the Government. All the important decisions and important measures taken by the Soviet Government are first decided upon in the party, and not in the Government agencies. For example, if you would take an analogous situation, if instead of the United States Congress deciding on matters for the American Government, the executive committee of the National Committee of the Democratic Party would make the decisions and then turn them over to Congress; and Congress would have nothing to do but unanimously adopt them. In other words, the Communist Party is the Government of Russia, and with all the fanfare and window dressing, the Soviet is only a rubber stamp for the Communist Party, which is the ruling power in the government in Russia; and, naturally, when the Communist parties are attached to an organization which is run, financed, and directed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which is the Government of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party becomes attached to the Government of the Soviet Union, due to that particular fact. They have to do whatever Government work is assigned to them by the Communist International, and they do it.

For example, in the Arcos raids, which I believe were discussed at the hearings, although the Communist Party is very important, it indicates to what extent Government institutions were used for Communist Party. The Arcos in London was the center for transmitting to all the Communist parties, particular the Communist Party in the United States, confidential information, secret reports, and so forth.

That information was transmitted to the Communist Party of the United States by the Arcos, and they had contacts for that purpose in all other countries as well. So you see no separation between business institutions of the Soviet Government and the activities of the Communist Party and their general agitation for a world revolution at that time. The Communist Party of the United States always was called upon to supply it whenever it had military information, industrial information, and diplomatic information. Very often we met with agents of the Ogpu for that purpose. The meetings were not with the political committee, but with the secretariat of the party. On the question of diplomatic information, when Bron—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). What is that name?

Mr. GITLOW. Bron—Saul Bron, the head of the Amtorg Trading Corporation in the United States. In 1927 he was the head of the Amtorg. There was no recognition by the United States at that time. That was before it was recognized.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Amtorg was a trading or business organization of the Soviet Government in the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. It was similar to the Arcos organization in London?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir. Lovestone and I, as Communist Party leaders, had a number of conferences with him on the question of what could be done in Congress to secure recognition of the Soviet Government; what Congressmen could be approached, how they could be approached, and how the work should be executed and carried out.

The CHAIRMAN. Those conferences were with Bron?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Ogpu agents were not there?

Mr. GITLOW. Not in these conferences; no, sir. In 1927, at the end of 1927, the secretariat of the Communist Party took one of its leading people out of the national office, the organization department of the party, and assigned him to the Ogpu to become an agent of the Ogpu, and to serve as a liaison officer between the Ogpu and the secretariat of the American Party. This comrade was known by the name of Nick Dozenberg. Nick Dozenberg was an old member of the party. He was originally from the Lettish Confederation, before the Communist Party was organized. He was the business manager of the left-wing paper published in Boston, of which Louis C. Fraina and McAlpine were editors. When we established headquarters of the party in Chicago he became an important worker in our organization department. Nick Dozenberg was a steady visitor to the national office, and met continuously with us on confidential Ogpu matters, turning over work to the party, and was also a source of income for the party because whenever he was required to get certain contacts or certain information from the party, the party was always paid for that information. In other words, the Ogpu appreciated the fact that the party was working together with the Ogpu, and out of its funds they would get a hundred dollars, \$250, \$500, as the case might be, to help the party along in its general activities in the country.

The Communist International maintained also very close ties with the Ogpu. Whenever the Ogpu had a special mission in any foreign country, the matter was always discussed with the Communist In-

ternational, and the Communist International representative went together with the Ogpu agent and cooperated and worked together with him. Whenever a mission was sent by the Communist International to China, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Germany, or England, that arrangement always prevailed, because there were situations in which representatives of the Communist International worked together with the Communist parties in the countries in which they were operating, and they would be in a position to secure certain information much better than the Ogpu agents could do directly. That was the general arrangement. The party's close tie to the Ogpu is also to be found in the number of our members who are engaged in the Ogpu, who have been or are engaged in Ogpu activities, those activities, of course, being linked with their other activities. Some engaged only in Ogpu activities. Let us take the case of Dozenberg: Whenever he was assigned as a party member to Ogpu activities in a particular matter, or when Nick Dozenberg was assigned, then he ceased to operate with the party. He never attended party meetings, and he never attended the branch meetings. He actually dropped out of the party. That was done as a precaution so that party members should not come in contact with him, except only a few top leaders of the organization. All those methods were pursued.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was done so that by concealing his identity with the party, he would be freer in operating?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir; operating as Ogpu agents, to my knowledge, were George Mink, Phillip Aronberg, Charles Dirba, Nick Dozenberg, and Pascal Cosgrove.

Cooperating with the Ogpu, to my knowledge, was Dr. J. Mindel, Alexander Trachtenberg; Juliet Stuart Poyntz was a direct agent of the Ogpu; and then there was engaged by the Ogpu activities at one time or another in some special work Jack Johnstone and Charles Krumbein, who went on a special mission to England, and Jack Johnstone who went to India and was apprehended by the British Government and deported back to the United States, of which he is a citizen.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Alexander Trachtenberg you mentioned as having been identified with the Ogpu—

Mr. GITLOW. I said cooperating with them.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he the head or manager of International Publishers?

Mr. GITLOW. He was during my time a main person in International Publishers; whether he is today or not I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. All those parties you mentioned have also been closely identified with the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; all of them.

Mr. WHITLEY. And their Ogpu activities or connections were in addition to their party affiliations?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. Connected with the Ogpu and the Profintern confidential activities Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, who went to Russia from the United States, whom I also mentioned before, and who came to America with a large sum of money during the early period of the party's organization, who operated under the alias of Scott.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Going back to the name of Charles Dirba, is this the same Charles Dirba who is at present the accountant for the Com-

unist Party of the United States and who has been an accountant for many years?

Mr. GITLOW. He has been in charge of the accounting department of the national office during my time. When Nick Dozenberg left the organization department Dirba took his place in charge of the accounting department of the organization. Whether he is still in that position I do not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is he also the head of the Central Control Committee of the Communist Party of the United States, to your knowledge?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; he became head of the Central Control Committee of the Communist Party.

Another activity in which the party was called upon from time to time to engage, at the direct invitation of the Soviet Government, was in constituting personnel of missions that came from the Soviet Government to the United States. When these missions needed translators or certain technical advice, as very often they do, they would appeal to the party and the party would assign translators or engineers or technical advisers to these Commissions, who would serve, I would say, in a triple capacity. In one way they would serve in the interest of the Communist Party of the United States, gathering on their trips with these missions whatever particular information we believed would be of benefit to the Commission.

They visited industrial plants, studied the temper of the workers, what they were getting, what possibilities there were in the organization of these workers, and so forth, and so on. And, at the same time, they helped to set some information for the OGPU while they were serving these missions, which the Russians themselves were not in a position to get, and all members assigned to these missions were paid by the Amtorg, and through the services we rendered the OGPU we got certain considerations by the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether Mr. Morris Pasternak was ever identified, in any way, with the OGPU?

Mr. GITLOW. That I could not tell you. He may be today, or he may not be.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether or not Marcel Scherer or Paul Scherer ever had any connection with the OGPU?

Mr. GITLOW. At this time I know Marcel Scherer and Paul Scherer very well. During my own time they had no connections with this activity. They may have at this time, because he was quite prosperous in business, and perhaps they are being used or paid by the OGPU for some purpose today. Whether they are actually or not, I do not know.

The question of passports, in my opinion, shows how the party operated in this country.

During my years of leadership in the Communist Party, the principle under which we operated at that time was that it was better for a Communist leader or a known Communist to travel with an illegitimate passport, that if you traveled with a legitimate passport you had to disclose your name, and since you were known as a Communist that would create all kinds of difficulties in foreign countries, and in order to avoid that it was best to travel with an illegitimate passport.

On the question of passports a tremendous organization was worked out on passports, and naturally the Soviet Government, and particu-

larly Ogpu, was very much interested in the passport activities, because the Ogpu generally traveled on false passports, and the Ogpu had to gather information about how the different countries printed their passports, and how to forge passports that would not be recognized by the border authorities, or by the authorities generally, as illegitimate passports.

As a result of that, two passport factories were in operation for the Comintern and for the Ogpu also. One was situated in Berlin, Germany, and the other was situated in Moscow itself.

When delegates or Communists from foreign countries came officially on Communist Party matters or on Comintern matters, the first thing they did was to turn their passports over to the Ogpu office of the Comintern, which was known as a special Ogpu office in the Comintern business.

When I came to Russia the first thing I had to do was to give over to that office my passport. I was given a Russian passport to travel around with as a member of the Communist International, but as far as the passport with which I traveled to Russia from the United States, that passport I deposited with that department, and the department could make whatever use they saw fit of a passport. So that they took my passport and gave me another passport, and I would not know anything about it.

Mr. VOORHIS. What department was that?

Mr. GITLOW. That was the Org Department in the Communist International, under the direction of Abrams.

At the same time all other Communists who happened to come with me to Moscow at that time had to go through the identically same procedure.

In 1928, when I headed a large delegation of American delegates to the Fifth Congress of the Red International of Labor Unions, all of us had to turn our passports over to a special committee which was set up by the Congress for that purpose. What they did with the passports we did not know, but I know very often that these passports were often used on special missions by the Ogpu and the military intelligence of the Soviet Union. They would study these passports and would know how to duplicate them and find out all the secrets of passports all over the world.

And in Germany there was also a passport factory engaged in the work of manufacturing passports for the use of the Ogpu and Comintern agents who had to travel secretly on confidential missions to all parts of the world.

When I first traveled to Europe, to Moscow, in 1927, I secured from the Canadian Government a legitimate passport, and the reason I secured such a passport through the Canadian Communist Party, and it has a special department which had to be established in Canada, was because the Canadian passport was good for 5 years and could be renewed for another 5 years. In other words, you would not be troubled in getting another passport for 10 years, and from that point of view it was a distinct advantage.

There were other leaders of the party that also secured passports.

When the Communist International representatives came to the United States they came to the United States on false passports. Generally they conferred with the Comintern as to how they should get to this country, whether they should come to this country as

Canadian citizens, or as German citizens, or as French citizens, and what routes they should travel.

Sometimes, when we wanted to ship Comintern representatives back to Europe we secured passports for them, the American party directly secured passports for them.

For example, we secured an American passport for John Pepper, who was a representative of the C. I. to this country, and the procedure for securing an American passport was a very simple one. It was not difficult at the time because of the requirements.

We would get a party member who was a citizen of the United States to make application for a passport. Generally we would select a party member who looked something like the party who was really going to use the passport.

Then two Americans who were citizens, members of the party, would go down with this party member to the bureau which took in applications for passports, either in Chicago, New York, or Philadelphia, or sometimes on the coast, and there make application for a passport, and when the passport was secured it was mailed to the national office of the party and it was turned over to the Ogpu department, where the original photograph was removed and a photograph of the person put on the passport, and all changes made, and he traveled as an American citizen on an American passport.

Mr. WHITLEY. In referring to the securing of a Canadian passport you used the word "legitimate" and said it was a legitimate Canadian passport.

Mr. GITLOW. There were two kinds of passports used by the Communists, by the Comintern and by the Ogpu. There were passports that were legitimately issued by the Government. Then there were passports which were manufactured, forged, printed in the passport factory either in Berlin or in Moscow.

Mr. WHITLEY. And did not come from the Government at all?

Mr. GITLOW. Did not come from the Government at all. The passport I came on came legitimately from the Government. It was issued, not in my name, but in someone else's name.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who was the head of the Ogpu department of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. GITLOW. Engaged in this work at the time was Dozenberg, and after him to handle these affairs was Dirba.

Mr. WHITLEY. When the passport was turned over to that department they would make the necessary alterations?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; we never inquired how they made these alterations; we were not concerned about them, but we knew they would be taken care of properly.

Mr. WHITLEY. Had those men had special training along that line to qualify them to make those alterations?

Mr. GITLOW. If they did not have special training, they had their own contacts with people who knew how to make the necessary changes. We did not know who these people were. We did not know that. The only thing we knew was that if we turned the passports over to them the necessary changes would be made.

Mr. STARNES. Was there anyone connected with the Federal Government who was aware of these activities?

Mr. GITLOW. I think the Federal Government was aware of these activities, because on a number of occasions Communists became in-

volved in the possession of illegal passports and action was taken against the Communists. For instance, Wagenknecht became involved with the United States Government when he secured an illegal passport. Also Krumbein became involved in the illegal use of a passport, and the Government generally, according to my information, knew that these passports were being used.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know whether there was anybody connected with the Government who was a party to these transactions?

Mr. GITLOW. During my time we had no contacts with the Government for this purpose.

I just want, in order to prove that I am not manufacturing documents—I kept possession of my passport that I used in my travels in Europe and to the Communist International, and this is the Canadian passport [presenting passport to the chairman]. These are the Russian visas to the passport [indicating], and this is a copy of the head tax which I paid on my arrival in New York, and this is the receipt [indicating] for travel from Moscow to Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. You were going under the name of James Hay?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. All these are under the name of James Hay except your Canadian passport. What name was that under?

Mr. GITLOW. James Hay also.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, did Jack Stachel occupy any position with the Org department during the period you were one of the leaders of the party?

Mr. GITLOW. In 1928 I was head of the organization department of the Communist Party, and Jack Stachel was the assistant to that department, but I was involved in so many other political activities that the detailed work of the department was handled by Jack Stachel.

Mr. WHITLEY. He was one of the group to whom the passports were turned over?

Mr. GITLOW. They may have been turned over to him directly to arrange for those changes.

Mr. WHITLEY. He was in the department that made those changes, or saw that they were made?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Browder was also connected with important OGPU activities, not in this country, although there was a connection between his activities and the affairs of the United States.

Browder was assigned two important jobs by the Communist International and by the Red International of Trade Unions. One was the establishment of a trans-Pacific trade-union secretariat at Hankow, China, in the year 1927.

Browder was one of the key men in this secretariat, and, together with Appleton, was the editor of the journals which the secretariat got out. In other words, it was an attempt on the part of the Communist International to make contracts with all colonial peoples and revolutionary forces interested in the Pan-Pacific situation for the purposes of the Soviet Union.

And through this secretariat the OGPU and the military intelligence department operated, and operated with the knowledge of Earl Browder. The money for carrying on these activities came from Europe to New York, and from New York was transmitted to Browder.

In other words, if a consignment of \$10,000 was made for the Pan-Pacific trade-union secretariat, that money first came to New York, was received in New York and then transmitted to Browder, and on one occasion Kitty Harris, who was the wife of Earl Browder at that time, took with her \$10,000 to Earl Browder.

At the same time Earl Browder was connected with a much more important bureau which was established as a business concern in Shanghai, China, where the Communist could not operate openly. In Hankow at that time they could operate openly, because Hankow was not connected with Gen. Chiang Kai Shek. But in Shanghai they could not operate openly. They had to operate under extreme difficulties and had to be very secretive concerning their activities.

He was connected with that bureau, and we assigned for work with the Shanghai Pascal Cosgrove, a native American, as tall as I am, or perhaps I was an inch taller. He made a very good appearance and could pass as a legitimate American businessman. He was assigned to work together with Browder.

Through that bureau, the most important one over there, the activities in that part of China controlled by Gen. Chiang Kai Shek were carried on.

Due to certain stupidities on the part of Earl Browder, the bureau had to be broken up very quickly, and all of the Ogpu agents and Comintern representatives operating through the bureau had to beat it as quickly as possible across the Trans-Siberian Railroad going to Moscow.

Mr. WHITLEY. In that connection you mentioned certain moneys sent to New York and then transmitted to Browder?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. To whom was that money sent, any of it?

Mr. GITLOW. The money I know of, the \$10,000 that was taken by Kitty Harris, that Kitty Harris took over—and I was in charge of the national office at the time—was received by Dozenberg, and Dozenberg came to the national office and asked us about it, whether we should send it all to China, or whether he should use it in his own way. Since he belonged to a different faction from the leaders of the party in this country, we were afraid if he got hold of a lot of money he might use it here for the American party. He immediately turned it over to Kitty Harris who went with it to China.

Kitty Harris, I understand, at the present time, is an agent of the Ogpu in foreign countries, and Margaret Browder, the sister of Earl Browder, is a member of the military intelligence department of the Soviet Government.

Of course, in Russia everybody had to have a passport, and the Soviet Union is not like the United States, where every person can travel around freely, because if you go to the Lux Hotel, which is a hotel maintained by the Communist International and you want to see somebody you have to present them with a mandate, which is a passport, before you can get in to see any one. Or, if you visit the offices of the Communist International you have to go down to a special office and present your mandate, or your passport, and then they call up, and then if you get a special permit you could get into the building and visit the various offices. If you want to see Stalin in the headquarters of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, in Moscow—and one of the newest, largest, and finest buildings is given over to

the headquarters of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union—you could enter those headquarters, and you have to submit your passport and credentials, and the person you want to see is called up, and if it is o. k. you can enter. There is no free entry of buildings like you have here in Washington. That is out of the question.

I have brought with me, because there may be charges made that I never was in Moscow, and that may be a double of mine happened to be there, so I wanted to establish the fact that I was there, that I had certain credentials under my own name, issued to me when in Moscow. I have the credentials issued by the Profintern during the Fourth Congress in the Russian name and in my own name.

The card which I will now introduce is recognized all over Russia as one of the most important of the passports, I would say. Showing this card will get you into any part of Russia, and you will get all kinds of privileges that you could not get otherwise.

I got this card when I was in Moscow in 1929 engaged in my fight against Stalin, because I was at that time a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. This card has printed on it, "Communist International" and inside is one of the pictures which the Communist International used, and here [indicating] is my own picture, and the statement that this is the card of Gitlow, who is a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, signed by Piatnitsky, who signed all credentials. This was better than this passport of Moscow because of the esteem in which the Communist International was regarded.

I want to give an instance of how I used this passport to my own advantage after my break with Stalin. I was kept in Moscow for a number of weeks doing practically nothing, most of my time waiting in the Comintern office to get an answer when I was to be permitted to go back to the United States. Finally, when permission was granted me to return to the United States, I saw Abrams, of the organization there, and requested from him, which was generally the procedure, a letter to the customs officials that I would not be bothered with a search on the Russian border when I was boarding the airplane at the Moscow airport.

He handed me a letter which was sealed and he told me not to break the seal or to read the contents of the letter, but to hand it to the airport authorities and everything would be arranged for me to leave quickly. Somehow or other I was suspicious of that letter and I kept it in my pocket and instead showed the Comintern passport which I had, and the officials went out of their way to be nice to me, examined none of my baggage, let me take out any documents, or material I wanted to take out. When I used it at the border, flying out of Russia—I used my Comintern passport again and got that kind of a reception. But when Wolf, who had opposed Stalin, left after me, and he had a similar letter and handed it to the authorities, they ransacked all of his luggage and gave him a search that lasted about 4 hours, and took all documents and materials away from him. So you can see the value of those passports, and I would like not to lose them.

MR. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, do you know whether Earl Browder ever traveled on a false passport?

MR. GITLOW. Well, I do not know. Perhaps he testified to that effect. I would not be in a position to know.

ИСПОЛНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ КОМИТЕТ  
КОММУНИСТИЧЕСКОГО  
ИНТЕРНАЦИОНАЛА

Приложение к письму № 102/г

МАНДАТ № 53

Председатель сего, тов.

Бирюзов

действительно является КАНДИДАТОМ в члены ИСПОЛНИТЕЛЬНОГО КОМИТЕТА КОММУНИСТИЧЕСКОГО ИНТЕРНАЦИОНАЛА

Секретарь ИККИ

Москва, 8 - 1921 г.



94931-40 (Face p. 4682)



Mr. WHITLEY. I thought maybe you knew of your own knowledge.

Mr. GITLOW. No; I do not know of my own knowledge.

Mr. WHITLEY. Getting back for a moment to the passport question, was this use of illegal passports on the part of the party membership and leaders during the time you were in the party extensive? How extensive was it?

Mr. GITLOW. As far as the leaders were concerned it was quite extensive, but the ordinary members who took excursions to Europe or to the Soviet Union procured legitimate passports. But leaders who went on missions, official missions to Moscow, generally traveled on false passports.

Mr. WHITLEY. Practically every prominent party leader who had been assigned to a special mission or traveled to Moscow for the party traveled at some time or other on a false passport?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, it was a general practice?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; it was a general practice.

Mr. WHITLEY. And it was not a matter of individual choice. The practice was known to and approved by the party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you name or do you know of any of the party leaders at that time, specifically, who used false passports?

Mr. GITLOW. I told you most of them did, and probably that information could be obtained by the record of their trips to Europe and to Russia. You could check up on that matter.

Now, I have hesitated a very long time before bringing up the following information to the attention of this committee. But after weighing the question for a very long time, I decided to bring this information also to the committee's attention because involved in this matter at the present time is a man whom I regarded as a sincere personal friend and who was motivated in his actions in this respect only by the fact that he was a firm believer in the cause of communism, and that what he was doing at the time would help to bring about communism, which he thought was a solution for the world's ills. Personally he got no financial consideration for his actions. He did it on a voluntary, idealistic basis, and for his activity he is serving a sentence in the Federal penitentiary of 15 years.

Guilty of the crime and the ones that should have been apprehended is not this man but the Gay-Pay-OO agents who operated in the United States and Germany in this matter.

I refer to Dr. Burtan, who is today in the Federal penitentiary serving a sentence of 15 years for counterfeiting.

This counterfeiting incident is tied up directly with the Gay-Pay-OO.

The CHAIRMAN. What is Dr. Burtan's first name?

Mr. GITLOW. Valentine Burtan. In 1928 the Soviet Government was very hard pressed for foreign currency, because whatever foreign currency it could lay its hands on it was storing or using in preparation for the 5-year plan. The 5-year plan was just about to begin.

At the same time the Soviet Union was going through an internal economic crisis which also curtailed the income of foreign currency. The economic crisis in the capitalist world contributed to this also, because commodity prices fell down on the international market, particularly the prices of wheat and other commodities which the Soviet

Union exported. The result was that instead of realizing the foreign currencies by the sale of the Soviet commodities on the foreign markets that Stalin expected, he got much less in return. The plan called for an enormous expenditure of moneys in the buying of machinery and equipment in the capitalist countries of the world.

The Gay-Pay-OO was faced with the proposition of either curtailing drastically its activities or of finding some other means of revenue to bolster up the activities of the Gay-Pay-OO.

Around that time the German Communist Party admitted to membership to the party one of the most expert engravers in Germany, a man who was so adept in engraving work that he could duplicate anything. He was a master at his trade.

This person was assigned to the Gay-Pay-OO. He worked in the factory of the Gay-Pay-OO for the forging of documents and other activities.

Through this German the Gay-Pay-OO established a counterfeit-printing plant in Germany, where money was counterfeited so expertly that they had very little difficulty in circulating the counterfeit money.

But the Gay-Pay-OO was very anxious to counterfeit American currency. In 1928 Nick Dozenberg was assigned by the Gay-Pay-OO to find out the secrets of the serialization numbers of American currency bills. He once inquired of me whether I knew where such information could be obtained, but I did not know. I had no contacts whatsoever.

After we were expelled from the party in 1929 it appears that Nick Dozenberg, acting for the Gay-Pay-OO, already had in his possession counterfeit American currency in the form of \$100 bills, which were being exchanged in Cuba, in South America, and in the United States proper. But the exchange was not going ahead as quickly as the Gay-Pay-OO desired. What they wanted was to make some contact, to make the exchanges on a large scale involving several million dollars.

Though expelled from the Communist Party, Nick Dozenberg maintained contact with some of the members who were expelled. Burtan, who was among those expelled from the Communist Party, nevertheless maintained the position that it was advisable for the expelled members of the Communist Party to get back into the official Communist Party and to unite the forces of the Communist international.

At that time, in 1933 or 1932, Burtan made the acquaintance, in a speak-easy, of a Germany ex-officer, an adventuresome fellow, who was engaged in the job of shipping contraband munitions from the United States to Latin American countries. Burtan picked up a good acquaintance with this individual and said that it would not be a bad idea: they would contact the Amtorg to arrange for the shipping of gas munitions, gas bombs, and so forth, from the United States to the Soviet Union, because the Soviet Union was very much interested in that, and also some of the latest forms of machine guns being manufactured in this country.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Gitlow, you do not have the name of the German ex-officer?

Mr. GITLOW. You can find that. He is also in a Federal penitentiary. He was arrested, together with Burtan, involved in this currency counterfeiting. Offhand, I just cannot remember his name, but he was the one who made the confession when he was arrested that they had counterfeited currency and involved Burtan, who also went to the Federal penitentiary.

Through this German officer the underworld in Chicago was contacted. They were first given a taste of how easy it was to pass the counterfeit money in Chicago, and then arrangements were made in Chicago to pass, I believe, around a million dollars in counterfeit money at one time. Burtan and this German were engaged in the job of getting the counterfeit money over to Chicago, closing the deal, and bringing the proceeds of the sale of the counterfeit money back to be turned over to the Gay-Pay-OO. The American authorities got wind of this situation. The German was arrested and he confessed. Burtan was arrested later on and the whole manipulation of this counterfeiting originated with the Gay-Pay-OO. The printing plant was never discovered because the printing plant was not in the United States. It was in Germany. The Gay-Pay-OO was never involved in this matter, though they were at the root of it. They were the real perpetrators of the crime, and a dupe who, out of idealistic purposes, out of the idea that he was doing something good, is serving a prison sentence for this crime.

I think in view of the fact that the Soviet Government today is in league with Hitler, that there is every likelihood that the Gestapo and the Gay-Pay-OO will cooperate with one another in gaining military secrets and information to aid Germany in the war against the democracies, everything must be done to root out their activities in our own country. And when the Communist Party is connected with them as it is, then the Communist Party does not operate in the United States as a bona fide political expression of the country. It operates as an agency of a government that does not hesitate to use any kind of a tactic in order to obtain its ends.

That, I think, will close my testimony for today. Those are the only matters I wanted to bring up. I thought you would have a short session and I am leaving the trade-union matters for Monday.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions before we recess?

Mr. VOORHIS. I have one question, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Gitlow, you said yesterday, I think, and again today, that on certain occasions you were detained in Russia. Now, you are an American citizen. I would like to know, to have you explain just a little bit exactly how they went about accomplishing that detention. What was the process that they used?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I will tell you what the process is. The process is the following: When you are a Communist representative to Moscow and you come to Moscow, you put yourself at the disposal of the Communist International. You turn over your papers and your passports and they finance your stay in Russia. They supply you with all the moneys, and so forth, and so on. If you have to buy a ticket, a railroad ticket, to take you outside of Russia, you have to go to the ticket agency, which is owned by the Government and operated by the Government. The Government operates the ticket agencies in Russia; no private individual. Naturally, you have to have the proper papers signed by the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs before you can leave Russia.

If you are an ordinary citizen in Russia and you have an American passport and you decide to leave, you have on your passport all the visas and all the necessary okays of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, and you can leave Russia forthwith.

But, as a Communist, you have to turn your passport over to the Communist International. You cannot go to the ticket office and present your passport, with all the proper authorizations, and buy a ticket. The minute you want to buy a ticket they will say, "Where is your passport?" And if you have not the passport, they will immediately call up and you will be taken in by the Gay-Pay-OO and questioned as to how it comes that you want to buy a ticket to Europe and you have not a passport. So you have to wait until the Comintern says you can now go back to the United States. Then you go to Abrams' office and he hands you back your passport with all the visas in perfect shape plus the money for you to travel back. And if they withhold that from you, they can keep you in Russia indefinitely.

I know of cases; for example, I know two representatives of the Czech Communist Party who were kept in their hotel for months, the hotel where I stayed, because they were in disfavor with the Communist International. They are not allowed to leave the country, and one of these representatives committed suicide.

But that is the means. Now, I, being an American, the United States Government was too powerful and they were afraid to arouse what might be a scandal in the United States. So, after they were sure that they had cleaned up the party situation in the United States, they gave me back my passport and papers and gave me permission to leave the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, the committee stands in recess until 10 o'clock Monday morning.

(Whereupon the committee took a recess until Monday, September 11, 1939, at 10 a. m.)

# INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

---

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1939

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

Present: Mr. Dies, Mr. Starnes, Mr. Voorhis, Mr. Mason, and Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Rhea Whitley, counsel to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Whitley, you may proceed.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, before you go on with the subject of Communist activities in trade-unions, I would like to ask you a question with reference to an individual. Are you acquainted with a man by the name of Julius Heiman?

## TESTIMONY OF BENJAMIN GITLOW—Resumed

Mr. GITLOW. I know Julius Heiman very well. I know him from the beginning of the left wing in the Socialist Party up to the present time.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you relate to the committee your knowledge of him and his activities?

Mr. GITLOW. Julius Heiman is a businessman, holding down a very important position in a commercial corporation, and during the early stages of the left-wing organization of the Communist Party, Julius Heiman supported the organization with funds, contributions of his own, and helped to maintain a monthly journal of the organization known as the Class Struggle.

When the left wing organized the Communist Party, Julius Heiman was attached to that wing of the Communist Party which was organized by the Russian Federation of the Socialist Party.

During the years 1920 and 1921, when the party received diamonds and jewelry, it had to be converted into cash, and Julius Heiman is the man who made the business arrangements for the conversion of the diamonds and jewelry into cash for the party.

Julius Heiman was never known to the party membership as a member of the party. His membership was always kept secret and was only known to the top leaders of the party. Nevertheless, he met with the top leaders of the party on the most confidential matters concerning the party organization.

Later, when it became necessary to organize a system for receiving moneys by cable and cashing the cables for large amounts, and converting the money in such a way that the party would not be jeopardized, and the source of the money hidden, Julius Heiman played a very important role in that respect, and up to the present time Julius Heiman is in a very confidential position as far as the party organization is concerned.

His daughter, Beatrice Heiman, is at the present time one of the most confidential and important secretaries of the Russian Embassy, and acts as secretary to the Ambassador himself. Beatrice Heiman is a member of the Communist Party and today serves as a link between the Russian Embassy in Washington and the Communist Party in America.

**MR. WHITLEY.** Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gitlow today is going to discuss Communist tactics and strategy in trade-union work.

**THE CHAIRMAN.** You may proceed.

**MR. GITLOW.** Anyone acquainted with the Communist movement in the United States will admit that the most important activity in which the Communist Party engaged is the trade-union activity.

By the trade-union activity I mean that activity on the part of the Communist Party that is for penetrating the trade-unions and gaining control over the trade-unions by having Communists and those who will do the bidding of Communists elected to official positions of the union, like president of the union, secretary-treasurer, and members of various executive and joint boards of trade-union organizations.

The trade-union activity today is not a haphazard activity, but it is an activity in which a party engaged seriously and methodically from the very inception of the party's organization.

When the party was first organized it had an impractical trade-union attitude. It supported the Industrial Workers of the World, fought against the American Federation of Labor as a bosses' organization, as a company union, and had very little influence or contacts with the trade-unions.

Lenin became alarmed at this attitude on the part of the Communists in America, and we received many admonitions from Moscow that our trade-union line was wrong, that we should change our trade-union line, and what was true so far as the American Communists were concerned in the early period, the year 1919, was to a lesser degree also true for the Communists in other countries, with the result that Lenin wrote a special pamphlet called *Left Wing Communism*, in which he very sharply criticized the attitude of the Communists, and especially those in America, toward the trade-union movement, and directed them to give up their policy of dual unionism, the opposition to the broad stream of organized labor in the country, and to immediately make contact with the trade-union movement, in this instance the American Federation of Labor, to enter these trade-unions, and, if necessary, to hide their identity as Communists, and if they can enter the trade-union as Communists, to begin systematic work for turning the trade-unions over to control of American Communists; in so many words, if you tell us, the Bolsheviks, that it is impossible to capture and gain control of the American Federation of Labor, that the American Federation of Labor is firmly tied up to the capitalist regime in America, that it is not

as difficult as overthrowing the machine itself, and if you think you can gain the objective of revolution, overthrow the Government, then if that is not impossible, then it is not impossible to capture and gain control of the American Federation of Labor.

To that objective the Communists applied themselves to the trade unions.

What I want to bring out at this time, and which I believe is very important to keep in mind, is the fact that the trade-union policy of the Communist Party in the United States is a zigzag policy. At one time it is a policy of dual unionism and at another time it is a policy of boring from within existing unions. At another time it is a policy of building revolutionary Communist unions and then, when the revolutionary Communist unions are liquidated the Communists can adopt the policy of boring from within.

Then it becomes a policy of splitting the American Federation of Labor and forming the C. I. O. and supporting that policy. Previously they were advocating the unity of the trade-union movement in the United States, in support of the American Federation of Labor, and then, all of a sudden they changed to one of splitting the American Federation of Labor and dividing the organized labor movement of the United States into two warring camps, one the A. F. of L. on one side and the other the C. I. O. on the other side.

If you will examine this zigzag policy or, as the Communists call it, the flexible policy of the trade-union movement, you will discover that every time a given change in trade-union policy is executed, that change is not motivated by conditions which prevail in this country. In other words, the American conditions have absolutely nothing to do with predicated that change, but that change is predicated by Russian polities and by the insistence of Russian leaders, and the orders which the Russian leaders give to the Communist Party in the United States in the execution of their trade-union work.

For example, I want to read you, to prove how closely Moscow follows the trade-union activities of the party—I want to read to you a letter which I received as the trade-union head of the party in the East from C. E. Ruthenberg, who was then the executive secretary of the party. He says:

I attach herewith a letter from the Comintern—that is the Communist International—

and the Profintern in reference to the trade-union work of the party, which you may be interested in.

Here is the letter of the Communist International to the Red International of Trade Unions, signed by O. W. Kussinen, secretary of the executive committee of the Communist International and A. Lozovsky, general secretary of the Red International of Labor Unions. At the present time Lozovsky is Assistant Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union.

APRIL 30, 1925.

*To the Central Executive Committee of the Workers Party of America.*

DEAR COMRADES: It is of extreme importance to the life and growth of the Workers Party that its members as a whole realize better the necessity of more intensive work in the labor unions. The labor unions are the basic mass organizations of the workers. They wage war against the employers as one of the most important sectors of the front of the class struggle. The capture of the leadership of the labor-union masses in their struggle is vitally necessary not

only for the strengthening of the Workers Party at the present time but also for the ultimate victory of the revolutionary struggle. The capture of the labor unions is our first and foremost task.

That the Workers Party as a whole does not yet thoroughly realize the exceptional importance of trade-union activity, is clear from the fact that only 40 percent of the party membership are members of labor unions, and even of these only very few are active in the latter work. If the unions are weak and are dominated by the reactionaries, it is the business of the Communists to strengthen them and to wage a relentless fight against the leadership and the policies of the reactionaries. In those places and industries where no labor unions exist the Communists must take the initiative and organize unions. We must not sit with our hands folded and wait until the labor bureaucracy finds it necessary to form unions. The organization of the masses into labor unions is the historical task of the Communist movement in America.

The party must use disciplinary measures to compel its members to join the labor unions and become active in them. It must be firmly fixed in the mind of every party member that no worker in an industrial country like America can be a real Communist unless he is an active labor unionist. The party must take a determined stand against any sign of slackness in labor-union activity. The work in the labor unions must be regarded as the basis which will determine the success of the party in most other spheres of work.

The Workers Party must render the utmost assistance to the Trade Union Educational League. Wherever the party has branches the latter must regard it as their duty to set up and maintain local branches of the league. Party members who are trade unionists must actively engage in the work of the league. In the league as a whole and in each separate labor-union organization the party members must be united in a Communist faction and on all questions act unanimously as one body. The league must resume publication of its central organ and extend its literature department, both of which must be supported by the party members and by the party as a whole. The idea that the league represents an organization independent of the party must be eradicated.

The Workers Party must also do everything within its power to prevent itself becoming isolated from the masses. It must resist the tendencies to reduce the Trade Union Educational League to the position of an exclusive organ of the Communists and their closest sympathizers, irrespective of whether such tendencies are a result of pressure from outside or of pressure on the part of the party members anxious to keep out nonpartisans. The party must strive to convert the league into an extensive left bloc organization lining up all the revolutionary and progressive elements in the labor unions against the reactionary bureaucracy.

The Communist strategy in the labor unions must be to unite, through the medium of the Trade Union Educational League, all the left-wing elements against the old officialdom and their policies. Every struggle of the workers and all everyday activities must be directed to this object. One of the important features of the work in the labor unions is without fail to utilize the elections of trade-union officers and of the delegates to the local, district, national, and American Federation of Labor conventions. Among the so-called progressive elements there is a growing tendency to develop an opposition against the reactionary labor union bureaucracy and to put up their own ticket in opposition to them at elections. This tendency must be stimulated and developed by the Workers Party as a means of bringing the workers under its influence. In every election, both in local unions, central-trades councils, and in the international union, the Communists, where they are not sufficiently strong to secure the election of their own candidates, must unite with the progressives and support joint candidates on the basis of the united front. It should be remembered that the officialdom of the American Federation of Labor and of the international unions does not represent a single reactionary mass. The closer the labor-union official is to the shop and the dues payer, the more subject is he to the direct influence of the masses of the workers. Among these elements there are many who are disgusted with the policies of the heads. This discontent, though not yet organized, nevertheless represents opposition to the old course. The party must give every possible assistance to the progressive elements in their struggle against the reactionary bureaucracy. The league must strive to establish a united front with these elements on the basis of a concrete program of action.

The league should be actively supported by the party in the prosecution of the league program endorsed at the third congress of the Red International of Labor Unions. Particular attention should be given to the following points:

**1. STRIKES AND WAGE MOVEMENTS**

The party must actively engage in every strike and wage movement. It must also arouse the masses to take up such movements. It must skillfully utilize these movements for political ends. It must have a program of demands for each mass movement of this kind and the Communists must fight for the leadership in the struggle. The wage-cutting campaign carried out by the capitalists must be opposed by a counter campaign of strikes.

**2. CLASS COLLABORATION**

The party must conduct a relentless war against all class collaboration plans, such as the labor banks, insurance companies, the B. and O. plan, etc., which are being foisted upon the workers by the reactionary bureaucracy. This campaign must be opposed by a militant struggle for a class-war policy. The party must steadily expose the incapability, corruption, and treachery of the reactionary bureaucracy.

On the question of labor banking, our policy must be to oppose the establishment of new banks on the present basis and to demand that the existing banks be reorganized on cooperative lines, that they break with Wall Street, and refrain from looking up strike funds in various investments.

**3. ORGANIZATION OF THE UNORGANIZED**

In every labor union the party must raise the question of the unorganized. The party should also utilize its shop nuclei for the organization of the unorganized and to obtain the leadership in all their struggle. Where labor unions exist the policy of the party must be to strengthen them. Where there are no labor unions the party must take the initiative and form unions.

**4. AMALGAMATION**

The campaign for amalgamation of the craft unions into industrial organizations must be vigorously prosecuted. The amalgamation movement must be put on a more concrete basis in view of the desperate resistance which the labor bureaucracy is putting up against it. This movement must be linked up with the everyday struggle of the workers and their everyday demands. In order to widen and extend the amalgamation movement, plans should be elaborated for closer cooperation among the unions in the various industries and localities. At the same time a drive should be launched for amalgamation of the unions on a national scale.

**5. CANADIAN AUTONOMY**

An active campaign should be conducted for the affiliation of all the independent unions to the American Federation of Labor, including the railway brotherhoods, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the revolutionary unions, etc. Where affiliation to the American Federation of Labor requires the development of the amalgamation movement, such a movement should be actively supported. The demand should also be raised among the American unions for giving autonomy to their Canadian sections, in accordance with the principles laid down in the program of the league.

**6. THE SHOP COMMITTEE MOVEMENT**

The party should vigorously push forward the movement directed toward the development of shop committees not only in the organized but in the unorganized industries as well. The shop-committee movement represents a powerful instrument for the organization of the unorganized working masses and the Workers Party should not fail to utilize it.

**7. THE WORK AMONG THE NEGROES**

Negro workers are becoming an ever more important factor in industry. The employers are doing everything possible to utilize them in the struggle against the whites, thus exploiting both the whites and the Negroes. The labor bureaucracy falls into this trap set by the employers and sets up all sorts of barriers to

prevent the Negroes joining the unions. This tendency must be relentlessly fought against. The Workers Party must demand the admission of the Negroes to the respective unions, and see to it that they receive equal protection with the whites. Where the leaders refuse to admit Negroes into the unions, special Negro labor unions should be formed in the particular industry.

#### S. CONNECTIONS WITH THE WORKERS OF THE COLONIES

The party, through the league, should set up close and permanent connections with the labor unions in the Philippines, Haiti, Cuba, and the other countries under the economic and political subjection of United States imperialism. The purpose of these connections should be to render the utmost support to the workers in the colonies and semicolonies in their political and economic struggle against the invaders.

#### 9. INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION UNITY

The party must launch an active campaign in favor of international trade union unity. It must fight in every trade union for the endorsement of the demand for a world unity congress and for the participation of the American Federation of Labor in it on the basis of the Red International of Labor Unions proposal. It must also fight for the support of the Anglo-Russian committee as the first step toward trade union unity and for the affiliation of the various national unions to the respective industrial secretariats.

The labor union work is of extreme importance to the consolidation of the Workers Party. Everything possible must be done to insure the success of this work. The various points of the letter must be closely studied and actively applied. If this is done, the party will widely extend its influence over the masses and be placed on a more solid basis. We call upon the entire party membership to put into effect the policies laid down in this letter.

With Communist greetings,

(Signed) O. W. KUUSINEN,  
*Secretary, Executive Committee of the  
 Communist International.*  
 (Signed) A. LOZOVSKY,  
*General Secretary of the  
 Red International of Labor Unions.*

Such communications and detailed programs on every phase of the trade-union activity have been sent to us regularly by the Communist International.

All international congresses, all meetings of the executives of the Communist International, all meetings of the Red International of Labor Unions congresses, executive trade meetings, and so forth, have always considered the American trade-union problems and considered them very important, and always made decisions on them, and gave orders to the American party as to how they should carry out the particular policies in the trade-unions, according to the views of the Bolshevik leaders in Moscow.

Now, another reason why the Communist International was interested in the trade-unions is to be found in the following facts:

First, there was the dual union attitude, in 1919, of all Communist parties, and, in a measure that dual attitude, the split of what the Communists call the "reformist" unions such as the A. F. of L.

And this attitude was the result of the confusion of the Bolshevik leaders. They believed in 1919 that the revolution which started in Russia would extend beyond Russian borders, and would result in a very short time in a revolution including Germany, and that from Germany it would spread through the Balkans and France, and that eventually England would be affected, and following that the United States as well.

They were very positive that the revolution that started in Russia at the end of the World War, with capitalism disorganized, and with the people sick and tired of war and opposed to the various regimes responsible for the war, and the very bad situation that had resulted, that the revolution would spread all over the world.

The Russian leaders felt that if those in control of the trade-union movement were opposed to revolution that, in their opinion, would stand in the way of the success of such a world revolution, and since they felt that that sentiment was back of them, with the wave of the revolutionary spirit which prevailed at that particular time, that they would have the masses of the people back of them, that they could defeat the leaders of trade-unions by dropping the dual policy and smashing the unions, and thus maintain their own control of the masses.

But they failed in that, and they had to change their policy.

So the policy was adopted of boring within the existing trade-union movement. When little was done in this respect they adopted the policy of the united front, a policy which they have followed up to the present time.

The united-front policy was adopted in a camouflaged manner to make more effective the tactic of boring within the existing trade-unions. Instead of merely having the Communists in the trade-unions boring within their trade-unions, Lenin decided that the Communists should decide on certain general broad issues, and on the basis of those issues, get together and force the trade-unions to act together, to act with a united front, and in that way gain influence in the trade-union movement.

When Russia began its 5-year plan of the rapid industrialization of Russia and the socialization of Russian industry and agriculture, the Russian masses were in a position, where the Russian leaders called upon them, to make tremendous sacrifices to put this plan across. In other words, the Russian masses, on the one hand, had to work harder than they ever did before, and at the same time tighten up their belts, and it was the Russian masses working on the one hand to carry out the 5-year plan, and on the other hand not getting enough food in their stomachs, and that was a situation which called for very clever handling on the part of the Russian leaders.

So they told the Russian masses that Russia was proceeding to establish socialism, and that the success of socialism in Russia would be followed by equal success in all other countries, and Stalin himself said that the victory of socialism in Russia is a victory for socialism all over the world.

They had to give proof to the Russian masses while they were making a supreme sacrifice for socialization of the Soviet Union, that conditions prevailed elsewhere where there was great dissatisfaction, as a counterpart of the constructive efforts for socialism, which the Russians were engaged in.

As a result of that the policy of dual unionism was developed, the organization of revolutionary unions, and the disregard of conditions indicated in all kinds of developments and actions in order to give the impression that the country was in great turmoil.

When the economic crisis broke out, all kinds of exaggerated stories appeared in the Russian press concerning conditions in the United States and the extent of starvation, that men and women who

died of starvation were cluttering the streets and alleys of the great industrial centers, and the unemployment demonstrations which took place at that time, particularly March 6 demonstrations. And this is an interesting side light in the Russian policy, that the March 6 unemployment demonstrations were ordered by the Communist International on an international scale, and on March 6, 1929, or 1930—I believe it was March 6, 1930—in every country in the world the Communists organized unemployment demonstrations. We had a tremendous demonstration in Union Square, in which over 100,000 persons participated, and the instructions went out to the membership of the Communist Party to make these demonstrations as violent as possible, as disorderly as possible and, if necessary, if the police interfered with the demonstrations, to engage in battles with the police, and that is precisely what took place at the March 6 demonstrations. You will recall that at that time three leaders of the Communist Party were arrested as a result of riots which took place as a result of the March 6 demonstrations.

As a result there were instructions issued to the Communist Party in the United States to utilize the demonstrations to create the impression there was great turmoil existing in the United States, and this, in turn, was exaggerated for the Russian masses to prove that they were in a position where their sacrifices for socialism were worth while, and to show them the extent to which workers in the other countries were suffering as a result of the laws of capitalism.

Now, how seriously and how completely, or how minutely the Communists gave attention to the trade-union work is evidenced by the minutes of the trade-union committee of the central executive committee, by the minutes of the political committee of the Communist Party, the minutes of its political committee, the secretariat of the Communist Party, and I want to read to you the agenda of a meeting of a trade-union committee, the executive committee of the Communist Party held on June 2, 1926.

There were present at that meeting Foster, Johnstone, Overgaard, William F. Dunne, Minor, Williamson of the Young Workers' League, and as observers present at that meeting Bittelman; Wangerin, a Communist active in trade-union work among railroad workers here in America; Miller, active in the automobile industry; and Bob, and Bob was the representative of the Young Communist International; Swabbeck; and Lovestone.

Comrade Foster proposed the following agenda:

When you see what this agenda was you can see that the whole industrial life of America was being considered at that particular meeting. The agenda included the following:

1, Mining ; 2, railroads ; 3, metals ; 4, textiles ; 5, needle—  
they mean the needle trades, the garment industry, and everything that has to do with the sewing of garments, and so forth—

6, shoes ; 7, rubber ; 8, the food industry ; 9, printing ; 10, State federation of labor programs ; 11, New York port bureau—

I spoke once before about the port bureau, organizing the seamen in special bureaus, controlled by Communists—

12, strike relief ; 13, Montevideo conference—

that was the conference held in Montevideo to organize the Latin American port bureaus, and to gain a foothold in the Latin-American trade-union movement—

14. youth: 15. Trade Union Educational League literature; 17, Pullman Porters.

Now, you can see that it was no haphazard consideration of trade-union affairs, but quite a complete consideration of the trade-union movement of the country. In other words, the trade-union committee of the central executive committee of the Communist Party acted like a board of strategy for the whole industrial life of America. And that is what it was precisely, because not only were trade-union matters considered, but all other matters allied to the question of the industries in which the trade-unions were active.

I have other minutes of the trade-union committee at which Browder was present because he, too, was a member at that time of the trade-union committee.

I understand that during the course of Browder's testimony he stated he never knew anybody by the name of Kitty Harris. I have the minutes of a meeting of the trade-union committee held on November 29, 1927, at which meeting the following were present: Ballam, Browder, Dunne, Foster, Gitlow, Hofbauer, Johnstone, Lifshitz, Wicks, Zimmerman, Toohey. Observers: Blankenstein, Harry—Harry was a Communist International representative—and Hermann.

At this meeting, which considered the conference that was to take place of the Trade Union Educational League, Foster came in with the following proposal: Foster proposed that we hold a T. U. E. L. national committee meeting on Friday afternoon, 2 o'clock, to take up various questions with reporters from the national committee; that we make a stenographic report of the conference; that Comrade Kitty Harris be charged with organizing a corps of stenographers and Comrade Margaret Browder be selected by the trade-union committee to act as assistant secretary to take charge of the documents, and so forth.

Browder was assistant secretary to Foster and editor of the Labor Herald, and at that time Kitty Harris happened to be Browder's wife.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, was it a general practice for the representatives of the Comintern to the C. P. U. S. A. to be known by one name; for instance, you refer to Bob, or a number of them just by one name?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, in the minutes they put down just one name and sometimes they put the alias down. The real name was never put down. In this country Comintern representatives always operated under aliases and never under real names. And in the minutes they go under their alias or under some first name. Now, Bob, for example, never went under any other name except Bob. That was his alias.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know what his right name was?

Mr. GITLOW. I forget at this time. He was a Russian, a young fellow about 22 years old.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, up to the time that you left the party, was it a general practice in the party for rank and file members to use assumed names or party names? I do not mean a hard and fast rule that was followed in every instance, but was it a general practice for members to have a party name?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I will tell you. The question of names in the party was carried out along certain general lines. There were exceptions, of course. During the party's underground period from 1919 to 1924 or 1923—the end of 1923—everybody in the party had an alias. No one operated in the party under his right name, and when you attended a party meeting you addressed your party comrade under his alias. If I went under the name of Pierce, why, when I got up to speak the chairman would recognize me as "Comrade Pierce, you now have the floor." And if another one was in the room, I used his alias, and not his real name. And after operating with aliases for a long time, and the party became an open party, very often at open public meetings the members of the party forgot their real names and used their aliases because they had been accustomed to using them so often in the work of the party organization. But in the party we always had before us the question of names. If school teachers joined the party organization, we knew that it was advisable that they should operate in the party not under their proper names but under assumed names. And school teachers that joined the party operated under an alias and not under their proper name.

The same held true for public service workers, letter carriers, Government employees, and so forth, who happened to become members of the party, although their numbers were not very large during that period. The number may be larger today. At that time they were not large.

Then if we sent persons into the field for organization work, and if they had a name which could not be pronounced easily, or might arouse some feeling of prejudice against them, their names were changed and more simple, Anglicized names used for these members. Even today if you check up the party papers like the New Masses and the Daily Worker and the other journals that they get out, or some of the organizers in the front organizations, you will find many, many names that are not the actual names of the persons, but just aliases which they use in the work of the party organization and in their work of party members in the front organizations.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, is this Kitty Harris living now, or do you know?

Mr. GITLOW. The information that was given to me is the following: That Kitty Harris has been induced to take up G. P. U. work outside of the United States—not in the United States—and is at the present time a G. P. U. agent either in Europe or Asia, or wherever they send her.

Mr. STARNES. Was she known by any other name at that time?

Mr. GITLOW. I only knew her at that time by that name.

Mr. STARNES. Was she an American citizen?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; she was an American citizen.

The importance, furthermore, of the trade-union work and its ramifications as far as the party is concerned, I will indicate by going through these minutes of the C. E. C. and the trade-union committee to give you briefly an idea of how seriously the trade-union activities are considered.

For example, here I have the minutes of the trade-union committee of the Central Executive Committee, November 26, 1926. The agenda contained the following:

International. What took place on the international question. A letter was received from Comrade Browder with a copy of a draft of the trade union thesis for the Comintern plenum. In other words, Browder happened to be in Moscow at that time and he forwarded an advance copy of the thesis which the C. I. drew up for the plenum on trade union questions concerning the United States. And that was being discussed.

Then mining was taken up. They considered the anthracite district; the activities of the young Communists in the mining fields, and the sending of organizers.

Metal mining was considered.

Then the machinist situation, which they called metals, including automobiles.

The shoe industry.

The needle trades, and practically every industry.

A meeting of the trade-union committee of the Central Executive Committee, May 23, 1927, the following agenda:

Railroads, mining, metal trades, needle trades, anti-Imperialism, Soviet Union, hands off China, textiles, boot and shoe, Trade Union Educational League, labor unity.

When they take up there the question of the Soviet Union, that had reference to the campaign which the party was carrying on for recognition of Soviet Russia and how this campaign was to be carried on in the trade unions.

The hands-off-China campaign was a campaign against intervention in China in 1927. The United States Government was considered one of the Governments which was interfering in the affairs of the Chinese revolution and how that campaign for hands off China should be conducted in the unions.

Anti-Imperialism was on the same basis.

Then I have here the minutes of a meeting of the secretariat, June 11, 1925:

Miners' campaign. Motion by Foster: That we print 10,000 of the miners' program at a cost of \$50, the party to bear the expense.

Now, this miners' program was not the party's miners program, but we drew up a program for the progressive miners, working inside the United Mine Workers of America. The program was written by the party, printed by the party, and distributed as a purely trade-union document among the miners.

Here we have a meeting of the executive council of the Communist Party; the New York needle trades situation was considered at length. I believe that was the only thing at this meeting.

Another meeting of the secretariat. Again the New York needle trades situation is considered, and decisions made on it.

Here I have a meeting of the executive council, June 23, 1925. The needle trades situation is again considered by the council.

We have a meeting of June 24. At that meeting the *Beal case* was taken up. Beal was an organizer of the textile workers. That was taken up by the secretariat of the party.

The United Mine Workers situation in West Virginia and Pennsylvania was considered by the party, and a motion was made by Comrade Foster that we endeavor to send Tom Tippett to West Virginia to write articles and secure material on which we can base our

policy. Tom Tippett at that time was working for the Federated Press and was not a Communist, but we were utilizing him for our activities.

There were others.

Here is a meeting of July 3. We have almost three pages, single space, of decisions in reference to the needle trades policy in New York City.

Meeting of the secretariat of June 24, 1925, considering the machinists' situation. At that time, the machinists' union adopted a policy that no member of the Trade Union Educational League could be a member of the machinists' union, and in this meeting of the secretariat it was decided that in the event members of the T. U. E. L. were Communists and were called before the committee of the machinists' union in reference to their membership in the T. U. E. L. or in the Communist Party, they should deny such membership in order to maintain their membership in the machinists' union for the purpose of continuing the work of the party in that organization.

Then we have here the minutes of August 7, 1925. We have here worked out a program for the anthracite coal strike in 1925. And, incidentally, I was assigned by the Central Executive Committee to be the direct representative and leader of our forces in the anthracite coal strike in 1925. We worked out policies in reference to that strike. And it is well to keep in mind that the one who was instrumental in having the party step into the anthracite strike was the representative of the Communist International to the United States who declared that the anthracite strike would give the party an opportunity of gaining a foothold among the coal miners and of participating in a strike which involved a basic industry in the country. He told us that the Communist International would be very much interested and would follow very closely our activities in the strike, because they were anxious that we break away from the light industries, particularly the needle trades in the East, and establish our roots in the basic industries of the country.

I have here minutes of the "Pol" Bureau—that is the political committee—held September 2, 1925, at which again the anthracite strike question was discussed, and at this meeting the policies were again laid down and developed for the strike.

Minutes of the "Pol" Bureau, October 1, 1925. The furrier situation in New York was discussed, and the question of what our attitude should be at the convention of the furriers' union and the question of the mobilization of the party for trade-union activity was also taken up.

Another meeting of the "Pol" Bureau on October 1, 1925, a continuation of the meeting. The anthracite situation was again considered and additional policies developed for the anthracite strike situation.

Then we have minutes of the "Pol" Bureau of October 12, 1925, at which the needle-trades situation was discussed in minute detail and motions made covering almost two pages on the needle-trades situation.

So we go all the way down the line: Needle trade, miners, International Ladies Garment Workers.

There was mention of the organization of the trade-union-delegation campaign, and here I want to stop for a moment and deal with that question.

In order to win the trade unions' support of Soviet Russia, and particularly to mobilize them behind a campaign for recognition of Soviet Russia, the Communist International instructed the American party to organize a delegation of trade unionists who would be invited to visit the Soviet Union, travel, and see for themselves, and draw up a report. The report should be used for propaganda purposes among trade unionists, and the trade-union leaders, who would be brought to Moscow, an effort would be made to win them over for the campaign of recognition in support of the Soviet Union.

In the minutes of September 15, 1925, the following motions were made; this is in reference to the trade-union-delegation campaign. Comrade Ruthenberg read a cable and a letter from Comrade Foster. Foster happened to be in Moscow at that time; and from Comrade Bittelman, who was also there, dealing with the trade-union delegation and proposing that the delegation reach Moscow by May 1:

Motion by Ruthenberg: That we send confidential instructions to all district organizers in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Chicago, that they take up this question energetically and organize trade-union fractions, to get support of the local trade unions for a local conference; 2, that they shall make this one of their principal points of work at the present time.

Motion by Lovestone: That we take up with Gold the question—

Gold was head of the joint board of the furriers' union at the time and he is a member of the Communist Party to this very date—

the question of the joint board of the furriers voting \$500 to start the organization drive for a trade-union delegation.

Motion by Ruthenberg: That the New York committee for the trade-union delegation forward \$200 for organizational work nationally to Chicago, that Chicago be the center of the work.

Then the party, upon instructions of the Communist International, started the work of organizing what was to be known as an impartial delegation of American trade unionists, who were not Communists, who would visit Soviet Russia, travel over the country, investigate conditions, and submit an impartial, unbiased report to the American people on what were the actual conditions in Soviet Russia.

And all this preliminary organization work and how to constitute the committee and how to organize it, was done by the Communist Party in the United States. And the money involved for expenses, that was first raised through the furriers' union by having them take \$500 out of their treasury, which was later supplied by Moscow, because the traveling expenses and all of the expenses involved in the organization of this delegation was paid by Moscow, and when its report was printed, the payment for printing the report also came from Moscow. But Moscow paid about five times what it cost to print the report, and the rest of the money went into the party treasury.

Mr. STARNES. Who were some of the members who went over there on that trip?

Mr. GITLOW. Some of the members who went over were Brophy, James F. Maher, Fitzpatrick, and others. I have that in the minutes.

Mr. STARNES. Will you supply those names for us so that we will have them in the record?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

## AMERICAN TRADE-UNION DELEGATION TO THE SOVIET UNION

Honorary chairman: L. E. Sheppard, president, Order of Railway Conductors; member first Federal Industrial Commission; chairman, United States Government Commission on Labor Conditions in the Hawaiian Islands.

Chairman: James H. Maurer, president, Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor; president of Workers' Education Bureau; chairman, Brookwood Labor College Committee; chairman, Pennsylvania Old-Age Assistance Commission.

John Brophy, president, District 2, United Mine Workers of America (1917-27); member executive committee, Workers' Education Bureau; member labor committee, Brookwood Labor College; vice president, Public Ownership League of America.

Frank L. Palmer, editor, Colorado Labor Advocate; member International Typographical Union; University of Denver and Denver Labor College.

James William Fitzpatrick, president, Actors and Artistes of America; Holy Cross College, and Catholic University of America.

Secretary, Albert F. Coyle, executive secretary, All-American Cooperative Commission; editor, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Journal (1921-27); chairman, Progressive Party of Cuyahoga County, Ohio; editor, Cooperative News Service; graduate of Stanford and Yale Universities.

## TECHNICAL AND ADVISORY STAFF

J. Bartlet Brebner, Ph. D., assistant professor of history, Columbia University; Oxford University, University of Toronto.

Stuart Chase, director, Labor Bureau, Inc., and certified public accountant, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University; author, Tragedy of Waste, etc.

George S. Counts, Ph. D., professor of education, Teachers' College; director of International Institute of Education.

Alzada Comstock, Ph. D., professor of economics, Mount Holyoke College; author, State Taxation and Personal Incomes.

Jerome Davis, Ph. D., professor, practical philanthropy, Yale University; expert on Russian affairs; author, The Russian Emigrant, etc.

Paul H. Douglas, Ph. D., professor of industrial relations, University of Chicago; author, Wages and the Family, American Apprenticeship and Industrial Education, etc.

Robert W. Dunn, research worker; A. B. Yale University; author, American Foreign Investments, Americanization of Labor, etc.

Arthur Fisher, A. B., Harvard University and Law School; former professor of law, University of Montana.

J. A. H. Hopkins, chairman, Committee of 48; National Bureau of Information and Education.

Carlos I. Israels, Ab. B., Amherst College; editorial board Columbia University Law Review.

R. G. Tugwell, Ph. D., associate professor of economics, Columbia University; author, American Economic Life, Industrial Coming of Age, etc.; editor, Trend of Economics.

Carleton Washburne, Ph. D., Stanford University; superintendent of public schools, Winetka, Ill.; author, New Schools in the Old World, etc.

Jurisconsult; Silas B. Axtell, J. D.; member, International Seamen's Union of North America.

## RESEARCH AND SECRETARIAL STAFF

Melinda Alexander, A. B., University of Montana.

Margaret Wood Cartwright, A. B., Urbana University.

Margaret Kennedy Coyle, A. B., Stanford University.

Stanislava Piotrowska, Universities of Kiev and Warsaw.

Sara Ragozin, A. B., University of Wisconsin.

Lois Perlmutter, A. B., University of Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean that John Brophy was one of those sent over there?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. When they went on those trips, I am assuming that they saw that the Soviet Union wanted them to see; is that right?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I can say that the delegation was split into three parts, and in 2 weeks' time they had to cover thousands of miles. Every place where they stopped they were met by a reception committee. They were given banquets. They were taken on sightseeing tours and they had no time to investigate actual conditions. They had what you call one wild party from the day they landed in Russia to the day they got out of Russia.

At the same time the technical staff surrounding the delegation, the staff of economists, so-called, and experts, who were supposed to advise the delegation on what they were seeing and to explain it to them—these people were all party people. And these were the people who actually wrote the report and when they wrote the report, their report first was O. K.'d by the Communist International and later on the American Communist Party again went over the report with a fine comb to see that nothing detrimental to Russia would slip into the report. And then it was published, and the one who actually wrote the report was Robert Dunn, who is one of the concealed members of the Communist Party parading as a non-Communist attached to the delegation.

He wrote the report. It was brought into the national office and our secretariat went over the report and Comrade Lovestone was assigned to see to it that the report would be bona fide and would be O. K. 100 percent in all respects before it was actually printed.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that was passed on to the workers and the people of the United States as the report of a nonpartisan, unprejudiced commission of workers.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; that is it.

Now, we have the minutes of January 8, 1925, and again we have additional motions on the trade-union delegation.

Motion by Ruthenberg that M. L. Johnstone be made the secretary of the Chicago committee by the executive committee, and so forth.

2. That the name of the committee be the committee for the American trade-union delegation to Soviet Russia.

3. That local committees may send delegates as they can finance, providing 25 percent of the money shall be used for financing the national delegation and the work of the national committee, and the organizers, and they should visit all the cities, and so forth, and so on.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, these excerpts that you are reading, those are copies of the original minutes of these meetings?

Mr. GITLOW. These are all copies of the original minutes of either the political committee, the trade-union committee of the central executive committee or the secretariat of the party. They are signed by C. E. Ruthenberg as general secretary of the party. At times by Earl Browder who was acting secretary of the party, or by myself who was acting secretary of the party, or by J. Lovestone, who was general secretary of the party. Every copy of the minutes had a rubber stamp on it, "Read and destroy," because the matters were considered of great confidence and it was required that the members of the central executive committee who received these minutes and acquainted with the leaders in the districts with what was taking place in the central executive committee, would destroy the minutes once they read them, and acquainted themselves with their contents.

Mr. MASON. What year did this trade-union commission go to Russia and bring back its report?

Mr. Gitlow. In 1927, I believe.

And so we have all through these minutes the trade-union work of the party, indicating that the major attention of the party was taken up with trade-union problems.

I will leave these minutes at the disposal of the committee so that they may include in the record all of these matters and the ramifications of the trade-union work of the party. I believe it is not necessary to go into details on all of this because it is just a reprettitious proposition. And since you can use it in your record, I think we can dispense with going through all this material at the present time.

Strikes in which the party engaged, and the majority strikes in which the party was engaged was anthracite coal miners' strike in 1935; the Passaic textile workers' strike, which broke out in 1926 and continued for over a year; the furriers' strike in 1926, around March 1926, which lasted a couple of months and ended in the victory for the Furriers' Union.

The cloak makers' strike, which could have been—the agreement could have been reached without calling a strike at all, and after the strike was in duration for a few weeks the strike could have been settled but for the Communist policy and was dragged out and the workers paid dearly for it.

The New Bedford textile strike in 1927; the Gastonia strike, which started in 1929, which was directly organized by the party.

These were the major strike activities of the party.

I took charge of the strike activities for the central executive committee, for the Passaic textile workers' strike, the furriers' and cloak makers' strike. These were the main strikes which I conducted for the central executive committee for the party, for the Communist Party, and I have here, which I also want to leave with the committee, minutes covering instructions of the committee.

I have here a page of minutes of the C. E. C., the committee dealing with the Passaic textile workers' strike and every detail of that strike. Now that also shows the important position, the important characteristics, of the Passaic strike.

The Passaic strike was a strike which was engineered and started and directed by the party. In other words, the trade unions did not start the strike in Passaic, but I, and the industrial organizer of the New York district, Comrade Bert Miller, read an item in the press that in the Botany Mills in Passaic a wage cut of 10 percent had been initiated, and we went down to Passaic and called a mass meeting of the Passaic workers; organized a textile committee and enrolled the workers into the organization; issued them membership cards and collected dues from them and prepared for a strike; and it was the party organization which called out the strike and the party leaders who directed every affair of that strike.

They had a general strike committee, but this general strike committee had nothing to say in running the strike. They were members of the general strike committee, but all the strategy, all the tactics, everything concerning the strike of the Passaic textile workers was initiated, directed, discussed, and decided upon by the C. E. C. textile committee, of which I was the chairman.

And the question of relief, everything concerning the settlement, and so forth, the attitude toward the A. F. of L. and all other things were handled by the party, and not by the workers in the industry.

We conducted the strike for policy objectives in order to enhance the party's end in Passaic; we utilized the strike to build up the party organization, to build up a youth organization, to build up a children's organization, to strengthen the relief organization, and to build up the International Labor Defense in New Jersey and in a thousand ways we utilized the strike for communistic purposes, and the workers—all they had to do was to listen to speeches and carry out orders which we made in that strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Right at that point the Chair has received a letter from John Brophy, dated September 11, 1939, addressed to the Chair and reading:

DEAR SIR: Recently Benjamin Gitlow appeared before your committee and made certain statements concerning me relative to the Communist Party. I deny completely and emphatically that I ever received one penny directly or indirectly either from the Communists or treasury of the Communist Party in my 1926 campaign for the presidency of the United Mine Workers of America.

I enter this denial, whether that statement was made by Gitlow or anyone else now or at any other time.

I am not a Communist, neither am I a Communist agent, as alleged, and never have been. I am and always have been opposed to the philosophy of communism. No one knows this better than the Communists themselves. If at any time they have expressed approval and apparently supported views and policies for which I have stood, they have done so without the advice, consultation, or permission from me.

If you will have this letter read before your committee and placed in its proceedings, I will consider that some little amends have been made for propagating the wild, lying, and slanderous statements about me which have emanated from your committee room.

That is signed "John Brophy."

Mr. GITLOW. I say it is very interesting to read the letter and the sharp language, which, as you know, is the general Communist practice when someone has made a statement, they charge he is a liar; and if Brophy received no money for his campaign for the presidency of the United Mine Workers of America, why does not Mr. Brophy come before your committee with the books of that campaign and show where the money was received from, and how it was expended, and from where he got the money, because he could not travel on nothing, and the leaflets and literature, and the organizers and the employees in that campaign cost a considerable amount of money.

Let Brophy produce the books to show the source of running the campaign for the United Mine Workers of America, and show what source the income came from, whether this place or the other place or the other place. And if he conducted the campaign without any money, well, he could not have gotten to first base, because he came very close to defeating John L. Lewis at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. You have already furnished a statement from the minutes?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. A certified statement from the minutes showing that to John Brophy had been set aside money for the campaign?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, surely; and I want to read additional proof of that, of the relationship of Brophy to the Communist Party; I will give that to the committee; it appears in several places, and it will take a little time, but I want to point out how closely Brophy worked with the party.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we take that up right after lunch?

Mr. GITLOW. All right, if you prefer; I will take that up after lunch and run through the minutes for it.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the date of the exact statement of John L. Lewis accusing Brophy of financial help?

Mr. MASON. In 1924.

Mr. MATTHEWS. 1924.

The CHAIRMAN. 1924?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. MASON. That was introduced as a Senate document.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As a Senate document.

Mr. VOORHIS. The date of the campaign was in 1926?

Mr. GITLOW. That was in 1926.

Mr. VOORHIS. This statement could not apply to that particular campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he have reference to, and in what campaign was it that John L. Lewis charged Brophy with receiving \$1,100 or \$1,200 from the Communists, from Moscow?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think one of the principal points brought out was cooperation between the Communist Party and Mr. Brophy, which began early in 1926 and involved financial support and as early as 1924.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to the Chair that this matter of Communists holding key positions in the unions is a very serious matter, and which I think should not be ignored and side-stepped; repeatedly we have invited union leaders to appear before the committee; we invited John L. Lewis to appear at the beginning of the hearings last year. We have invited the Non-Partisan League to appear. This is a matter that is of vital interest to the committee and to the country.

Certainly, in view of the evidence presented before this committee, no union should want to have Communists holding key positions in the union.

The Chair feels that the time has now come for the union leadership to take the initiative in this matter, if the things presented before this committee are not true, and make available their books and records dealing with these charges which we have had presented before us for a long time. This committee is interested in knowing what the facts are with reference to the charges and not in slandering anyone nor in hurting any union activities but in helping the unions by pointing out the activities of those masquerading under union colors.

I suggest, therefore, that right at this point Dr. Matthews be permitted to question this witness with reference to the leadership of the C. I. O. with reference to their Communist affiliations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, you are acquainted with the fact that John Brophy is at present a director in the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And, as you say, you were for a long time connected with the executive committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And were familiar with his cooperation with the Communist Party.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you have, since your expulsion from the Communist Party, followed trade-union activities, have you?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I have followed trade-union activities.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you have been acquainted with the development of trade-union movements since that time.

Mr. GITLOW. But not from the inside as I was at that time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I know. You know Lee Pressman is counsel for the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At the present time?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And what is your information or observation concerning the policy carried out by Mr. Pressman with regard to the work of the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. I could not swear to Pressman's communistic affiliation; if he is affiliated with the Communists, I would not know in that respect.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I see.

Mr. GITLOW. Whether or not he lends moral or other support to the Communist campaign I think is a matter of common knowledge.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A matter of common knowledge?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have that from many persons who are in the trade-unions?

Mr. GITLOW. I have investigated and studied the question, and I have spent, before I came to the hearing, I spent several hours with Stolberg, who openly charges that one of Stalin's main men in the C. I. O. is Pressman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with the fact that Len DeCaux is at the headquarters of the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know he was formerly connected with the Federated Press, or do you know anything about the Federated Press?

Mr. GITLOW. I know something about the Federated Press; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was organized during your period, was it not?

Mr. GITLOW. Not originally; it was once a party newspaper and we exerted considerable influence on the Federated Press and the people who were members of the Federated Press. And some of the Federated Press people became members of the Communist Party, like Harvey O'Connor and some of the others.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know A. J. Isserman, one of the editors of the C. I. O. News?

Mr. GITLOW. I know Isserman, but I don't know whether it is the same one; I know Isserman in the office at Trenton, N. J., I believe, who handles the Communist legal matters in New Jersey.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He handles the Communist legal matters?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And he also worked on the International Labor Defense?

Mr. GITLOW. International Defense, and was known generally as a Communist in New Jersey.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What about an attorney in Passaic called Leo Gallagher?

Mr. GITLOW. I am acquainted with him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are acquainted with him?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you know he is affiliated with the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. I don't know whether he is affiliated, but he cooperates in the work with the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Works with the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. That was in my time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know from personal knowledge?

Mr. GITLOW. From personal knowledge.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are acquainted with the fact that James B. Carey is secretary of the C. I. O. at the present time?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And, based upon your acquaintance with the workings of the Communist Party, you know that Mr. Carey has played an important role in the American League for Peace and Democracy, and would that be evidence of his cooperation with the Communist Party in his principle union plan?

Mr. GITLOW. All I could say is the League for Peace and Democracy, as has been testified before this committee, is one of the front organizations of the Communist Party. It was originally started as a League against War and Fascism and then it was changed to the League for Peace and Democracy; and it was started here, and the money for its organization came here—I was not connected with the party but I know that definitely—came here from Moscow; and I know that at one of the organization conventions, the first convention which was held in New York—maybe you will want to refresh my recollection as to the year—

Mr. MATTHEWS 1933?

Mr. GITLOW. I think it was thirty-three; that before that convention was opened the representatives of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party met with representative of the I. L. D., with certain trade-unionists, and discussed how to run the convention: and everybody who met with them recognized that the Communist Party ran the convention.

And when the convention was opened there were a number of delegates who represented organizations which were expelled from the Communist Party, and that caused a great furor in the convention, but it was common knowledge to everyone in the active Socialist Party and those in the trade-union movement who had anything to do with the Communist Party that the Communists were running it from the top.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I see.

The CHAIRMAN. Right at that point, I think it ought to be made clear that it is a fact that there a was a great many people in the League Against War and Fascism, later known as the League for Peace and Democracy, who are not acquainted with the fact that it was Communist control.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think that it ought to be certainly clear, because there is evidence before this committee presented in the last hearing, of some 500 or 600 Government officials who were members of the League for Peace and Democracy and evidently they had no idea what was at the head of it, as was demonstrated to this committee, when they opposed it, and assumed a very antagonistic attitude about its investigation. Whether they are still in the league,

or still belong to it, I do not know, but evidently there must be a great number of them who had no idea of what it was all about.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. It is true that there were a large number of prominent Government officials and clergymen and people known in public life—educators, college professors, and trade-union leaders.

Mr. STARNES. And legislators.

Mr. GITLOW. And legislators who have been induced to become sponsors for the League for Peace and Democracy: and it is my opinion that if one becomes a sponsor for an organization, that person becomes responsible for every activity of that organization, if not directly, indirectly.

And it is very strange that here the Soviet Union concluded a non-aggression pact with Nazi Germany, and the League for Peace and Democracy, which got its standing and obtains its support on the basis that it was fighting against Nazi Germany, and yet the league came out in support of that pact. The league could not do otherwise, for reasons which I will explain a little later how that is done, but I have not heard of many of the sponsors since the league came out in support of the pact between Stalin and Hitler renouncing the league for its position.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a strange thing, so far as I am individually concerned, that here in the city of Washington we have some prominent officials who belong to the league, and even after the league had taken a position that is absolutely indefensible, it seems to me, there has been no effort on the part of the sponsors to condemn the league for its participation and the attitude of the league with reference to the endorsement of Nazi Germany.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think the time has come when the people of America who have been sponsors, who have been innocently affiliated with these organizations, should take a definite stand on this matter and let us know where their sympathies lie.

Mr. VOORHIS. I think that is true, but I also think that it is important to remember that there are a great number of people who were anti-Fascist who were induced to become interested in organizations like this and like certain other organizations on the basis of that appeal.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS. And I do not think we can take the position that evidence of mere affiliation with this organization is evidence of a person being a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GITLOW. I agree with you 100 percent, but, nevertheless, when these persons whose opinions and expressions mean something in public life in critical periods like the one in which we are living, that it is not only for them but for all people of the United States to declare themselves.

Mr. VOORHIS. I think that is correct: and I think, furthermore, that the question of their attitude toward the Soviet-German pact is a pretty good test.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. As to whether a person is a free agent sincerely trying to follow certain lines of action to improve conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not see how this committee can accept a letter from Mr. Brophy as evidence. This committee is open for him to

appear before it. And, for that matter, anyone else; this is the logical place for them to present their statements. And, as has been indicated, there are five, six, or seven hundred members of the league in the Government—

Mr. MASON. Some in important Government positions.

The CHAIRMAN. And I think we ought to have some expression from them as to whether they still approve of this league, whether they approve the policy of the league with reference to the Nazi Government, and, if they want to be heard, we want to hear them. But, insofar as letters are concerned, they are not evidence, and this letter is not evidence before the committee.

I am going to instruct the secretary to get in touch with Mr. Brophy and tell him that the committee will be glad to hear from him, that the committee does not want to judge anybody until it has heard him, but that he will have an opportunity to appear and subject himself to cross-examination like other witnesses.

Mr. STARNES. I want to say that I heartily endorse that statement, and as a member of this committee I do not think that a letter, which answers a charge by making another charge, is any answer at all, and I, as a member of the committee, am not going to give any weight whatever to a letter put in here, not supported by affidavit, which purports to reply to a witness who has come before the committee and testified under oath and is subject to cross-examination. Anyone can make the wildest kind of a statement, that is irresponsible, when not under oath, but until that man comes before this committee under his solemn oath and makes answer to a statement which has been made under oath, then I do not think the committee should give any weight at all or credence to such a letter.

This committee is wide open to hear anyone who wishes to reply to attacks made on him, but they should come here under oath if they want to deny any statements made about them regarding their public life or their private life.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the pleasure of the committee as to placing this letter in the record?

Mr. MASON. I certainly would not permit the letter to become a part of the record.

Mr. VOORHIS. I do not see why it should not be in the record if he is coming.

Mr. STARNES. The chairman has already read the letter into the record and I do not think it matters now.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, let us proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, you spoke of the first congress of the American League Against War and Fascism, which was held in 1933. Do you know Donald Henderson, who was connected with the American League Against Force and Fascism in those days?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And do you also know that Donald Henderson is head of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers?

Mr. GITLOW. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is there any question whatever about Donald Henderson being a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. No question whatever about his membership.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is a matter of public record?

Mr. GITLOW. It is a matter of public record; and incidentally I would like to give to the committee the pattern which the Communist Party uses in building or organizing its front organizations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you want to do that in a moment or do you think it would be better to cover it at this point?

Mr. GITLOW. I think I could do it later if you do not want to take it up at this time.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just in a moment or two. Do you know that Donald Henderson is at the present time one of the members of the executive board of the C. I. O., by vote of the representatives of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers?

Mr. GITLOW. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted, Mr. Gitlow, with Marcel Scherer?

Mr. GITLOW. I am very well acquainted with him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with his activities at the present time in the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians?

Mr. GITLOW. I am.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What have you to say about Mr. Scherer's connection with the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Mr. Scherer—there are two brothers and one sister who have been members of the Communist Party since its very inception. Marcel Scherer, Paul Scherer, and I am not familiar with the first name of the girl. Scherer has held all kinds of positions in the Communist Party. He has held various positions as a section organizer and has been assigned by the executive committee to all kinds of party work; he is one of the oldest and trusted members of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that he was and has been from the beginning an active organizer in this Union of Architects, Engineers, Chemists—

Mr. GITLOW (interposing). I do, surely.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you have no reason to doubt that this organization, this union, is one which was sponsored directly by the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. There is no doubt if Scherer is head of it. And they could not get a better man to carry out the party's policy than in the use of Scherer.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you consider that this union is one of the strongholds of the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As representative of the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, are you acquainted personally with Ben Gold?

Mr. GITLOW. I know Ben Gold; I am very well acquainted with him: I directed the affairs of Ben Gold in the most critical situation during the membership campaign of his union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you know that Ben Gold has been and for sometime was a member of the Furriers Union?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you know that Ben Gold is a member of the executive board of the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. From the Furriers Union.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are acquainted with the publication Communist?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I read from the Communist the statement by Jack Stachel, on page 1101—Mr. Gitlow, I intended to ask you if Ben Gold was, to your personal knowledge, a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Ben Gold, from my personal knowledge, was a member of the Communist Party from the year 1920 on.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And he has, according to your own first-hand knowledge, been a candidate for office on the Communist Party ticket?

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Of New York City and New York State?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes. Not only has he been a candidate on the Communist Party ticket but he has been on Communist Party committees.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Earl Browder himself introduced evidence to this committee to the effect that Ben Gold is a member of the Communist Party of the United States at the present time.

Mr. GITLOW. Of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Reading from the November 1934 issue of the Communist, page 1101, a statement by Jack Stachel:

The San Francisco strike proves that it is not only possible for the Communists to organize and lead struggles in the American Federation of Labor unions but that it is possible to win struggles.

Will you identify Jack Stachel, briefly, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, Jack Stachel is an important figure. In my opinion, Jack Stachel today is more important to the organizational affairs of the Communist Party than Earl Browder. He holds the position of national secretary to the Central Executive Committee. Jack Stachel is not a public figure but a man behind the scenes. The Communist International holds him in highest esteem and he has its confidence.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Reading again from the same article, on pages 1104 and 1105, we have the following statement:

What will happen if the workers elect not only one Bridges, but hundreds of Bridges, in the section and district leadership, not to speak of national leadership? There will be big struggles; the workers will become revolutionized.

Mr. Gitlow, being acquainted with the writings of the Communists, would you say that that statement constitutes an admission in an official publication of the Communist Party that Bridges is either a Communist Party member or very closely working in cooperation with the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. The chances are 90 percent he is a Communist Party member and 10 percent one who works very close with the party and is willing to carry out party orders. When they say "hundreds of Bridges," then they mean the Communist Party would establish a nucleus among marine workers that would carry out party orders and party instructions, and the party would run the whole show.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, this statement is evidence of the fact that Bridges had, in the San Francisco strike, carried out party

orders, would it not, which Stachel described as a strike organized and led by Communists; it is evidence that the Communist Party is completely satisfied with the leadership of Harry Bridges?

Mr. GITLOW. It represents more than that. If Stachel writes that the strike was organized and led by Communists, that meant that the leaders of the strike met together with the representatives of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party and worked out all the strategy for the strike. In no other way could he make such a statement.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know Harry Bridges is head of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union?

Mr. GITLOW. I know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know also, by virtue of that position, he is a member of the executive board of the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, are you acquainted with Joseph Curran, or his record in trade-union activities?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I cannot place Curran. He is in the Marine Workers' Union?

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is head of the National Maritime Union.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, the National Maritime Union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know his record?

Mr. GITLOW. I know of the controversies that have been going on in the Maritime Union, the various oppositions that have sprung up from time to time and charged Curran with being a Stalinite and member of the Communist Party and taking orders from the Communist Party. I know many of his lieutenants are members of the Communist Party—Roy Hudson and others. I know George Mink, who was a Communist, played an important role in that organization on various occasions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And Roy Hudson was the head of the organization which became merged with the present union?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; and Roy Hudson is not only a member of the Communist Party, but Roy Hudson is a member of the political committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And Joseph Curran is also a member of the executive board of the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have already stated, Mr. Gitlow, in your testimony, that Powers Hapgood was at least at one time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. According to your personal knowledge?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know that Mr. Hapgood is at present head of the United Shoe Workers of America?

Mr. GITLOW. Let me give you a little of the record of Powers Hapgood, because I would not want to do an injustice to anybody.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Certainly.

Mr. GITLOW. Powers Hapgood was, during our miners' campaign, a member of the Communist Party, but not an open member of the Communist Party, and worked together with Brophy in the miners' campaign. Later on we assigned him to the Sacco-Venzetti campaign, in 1927, I believe, and he went to New England, to the Boston

district. In the Boston district he married Mary Donovan, who was a member of the Socialist Party, and Mary Donovan became a candidate for Governor of the Socialist Party in the State of Massachusetts. At that time we received a communication from our organization, our district organization in Boston, asking what kind of policy the party in Boston should pursue toward Mary Donovan, who was running on the Socialist ticket, and to Powers Hapgood, and we instructed the Boston district to engage in a campaign against Mary Donovan Hapgood as a Socialist, as a betrayer of liberty, as one who had not done the proper thing in the Sacco-Vanzetti campaign, and to lay off Powers Hapgood and not attack Powers Hapgood.

Later on, when the policy of the union changed and the party again developed a dual Communist policy, and when the party split from the miners' union and organized the national union, Powers Hapgood broke with the Communist Party on that policy, and the Communist Party began to attack Powers Hapgood. But what his position is today I don't know, except this: Powers Hapgood has supported many of the front organizations of the Communist Party and has come out in defense of their position; but whether he is a member of the Communist Party at the present time or not, I am not in a position now to say.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that Powers Hapgood is at least a member of the executive board of the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. By virtue of his leadership of the United Shoe Workers of America?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, are you acquainted with Harold J. Pritchett, head of the International Wood Workers of America at the present time?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I am not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, there has been evidence introduced already in the hearing to the effect that Mr. Pritchett is a member of the Communist Party. This witness does not know that.

That has developed since your time?

Mr. GITLOW. Since my time; I don't know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you any information concerning Michael Quill, the head of the Transport Workers' Union?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I know of his activities and I know many who vouch for his membership in the Communist Party; but, directly, I am in no position to vouch for that.

Mr. STARNES. Is he the man, Mr. Matthews, in Brooklyn, N. Y.?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Who is a member of the city council. There is testimony by numbers of witnesses last year to the effect he was, and the secretary of his faction had collected dues from him for a period of more than a year.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Both Pritchett and Quill are also members of the executive board of the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What would be your information, if any, concerning Louis Merrill, head of the United Office and Professional Workers?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, Louis Merrill I happen to know. That is not his real name: I forget his real name, but he goes under a different

name. That is an alias; his real name is not Merrill, and Merrill is a member of the Communist Party and he has conducted the affairs of the office workers' union in such a manner that all those elements in the office workers' union who are not Communists had to break away from the office workers' union and rejoin the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that has happened—

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In San Francisco and certain sections?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I am not acquainted with the San Francisco situation. I know the New York situation and I know that happened.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you have testified to Mr. Merrill's membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You also know he is a member of the executive board of the C. I. O. by virtue of his membership in the United Office and Professional Workers' Union?

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know Mr. Heywood Broun?

Mr. GITLOW. I know Heywood Broun.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And Mr. Broun is head of the American Newspaper Guild. Do you know that up until August 24, 1939, Mr. Broun was, let us say, universally known in trade-union circles to be carrying out Communist Party policies?

Mr. GITLOW. It is generally stated he was carrying out Communist Party policies in the trade-unions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know since August 24, 1939, Mr. Broun has spoken in no uncertain terms concerning the Soviet-Nazi pact?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I was delighted in reading of the attack he made.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know Mr. Broun is a member of the C. I. O. executive board?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted at all with the record of Mervyn Rathborne, head of the American Communications Association?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I am not.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At this point again, Mr. Chairman, I think there was testimony last year in connection with Mervyn Rathborne's connection with the Communist Party. Mr. Gitlow, I have read you the names of 22 persons who occupy top positions in the C. I. O. Most of them you have identified, as the record will show, from your own knowledge, as party members, or as persons who have been party members in the past, or as persons who have carried out, in their trade-union activities, policies of the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you say that that picture justifies the numerous statements, made by Earl Browder and others, that the Communist Party is 100 percent behind the drive of the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, I think the Communist Party, if they could make it more than 100 percent, is behind the drive of the C. I. O. In fact, in my opinion, the organization of the C. I. O. was the culmination of a long effort on the part of the Communist Party of the United States to carry out a policy in reference to trade-union work, which was laid down by Lenin in 1921.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And the Communists have some justification, have they, for the claim that they have led some of the recent struggles in which the C. I. O. unions have engaged in this country?

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, I think they can claim credit for a great deal of that. They may exaggerate on the extent of it; but, nevertheless, recognition of that fact must be taken.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are acquainted, are you, with Maurice Sugar, attorney in Detroit?

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, of course, I am very well acquainted with him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know Maurice Sugar has acted as attorney for the auto workers' union?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I know Maurice Sugar is an old member of the Communist Party of the United States, practically from its inception. When I was in the party, every time I visited Detroit, I conferred with Maurice Sugar and he attended confidential meetings of the organization. Maurice Sugar may deny at this time that he is a member of the Communist Party, but he was always a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know Maurice Sugar recently sued a worker for libel on the ground that the man had charged him with being a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. I know that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that libel suit was tried before a jury in Detroit recently?

Mr. GITLOW. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And do you know the verdict of the jury in that case?

Mr. GITLOW. The verdict of the jury was against Sugar.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In other words, the jury was not convinced by Mr. Sugar's denial of membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the total number of directors in the C. I. O.—40?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The executive board of the C. I. O. is 40 members. They are the heads of the constituent unions of the C. I. O.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, to what extent has the Communist Party penetrated the A. F. of L.? You have talked about the C. I. O.; what about the unions in the A. F. of L.: what about this teachers' union? Do you know about that teachers' union in New York?

Mr. GITLOW. I do, to some extent: not from intimate, close knowledge, but I know about the affairs of the union and I know recently an internal struggle took place in the teachers' union and some teachers and professors withdrew from the organization on the grounds that the organization was dominated by the Communist Party and was more interested in carrying out the political objectives of the Communist Party than in working for the interests of the teachers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know John Dewey, the famous psychologist, who withdrew from the teachers' union—

Mr. GITLOW. I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS (continuing). Because of his claim that the American Federation of Teachers was dominated by the Communists?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you acquainted with Louis Weinstock?

Mr. GITLOW. I am.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether or not Louis Weinstock is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. Louis Weinstock is a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And has been for some years?

Mr. GITLOW. For a considerable time; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He is a member of one of the A. F. of L. unions in New York, is he not?

Mr. GITLOW. In the painters' union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The painters' union of New York?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; another union in which the Communists have a considerable influence is in the food workers' union of the Cafeteria Workers' and Waiters' Union, Local 16. The Cafeteria Workers' Union is dominated completely by Communists in local 16 and a Communist who holds a leading position there is Rubin—I forget his first name; I think it is Jay Rubin. And he is also leader in the hotel union, which recently closed an agreement with the New York hotels. Rubin has been a member of the Communist Party, also its executive board, and a member of district executive committees, and has been district organizer for the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. They are affiliated with the A. F. of L.?

Mr. GITLOW. These are A. F. of L. unions; yes. And other parties in one of those local unions are Obermeier and Gitz, and some others whose names I cannot mention at the present time. And it is interesting to know that in local 16 the Communists gained control by making a united front with the racketeer elements of local 16, who are part of the "Legs" Diamond mob, and they made a united front and, as a result of that united front, they gained control of local 16. And in local 16, at the present time, a tremendous opposition is going on because there is no democracy in the running of the affairs of the local and the affairs of the local are being run in such manner that a large treasury has been liquidated since the Communists got control.

The CHAIRMAN. To what extent have the Communists penetrated the A. F. of L. in recent years?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, the Communists have penetrated the A. F. of L. to not very—not to any great extent. It is here and there a local union situation and, where they did control, as they did through Weinstock, the painters' situation; Weinstock was decisively defeated in the last election and the Communist Party Joint Council of New York was changed and a bona fide A. F. of L. group took charge of the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The A. F. of L. is cleaning house, is it not?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is generally understood they are cleaning house?

Mr. GITLOW. To some extent. And in many of the unions the question of Communists is not a problem in the A. F. of L. union.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Gitlow, do you know anything about the American Federation of Teachers?

Mr. GITLOW. No; not enough to vouch for what is going on in the organization, and I would not care, under oath, to say things which I am not acquainted with.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Gitlow, if here is a union that has key jobs held by Communists, who are members of the executive board, does not that create a rather serious situation from the standpoint of the unions and from the standpoint of the country itself?

Mr. GITLOW. It creates a serious situation from both standpoints, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, it is more than a question of opposing political views; it is a question that here are men holding positions on an executive board, or other key positions, who are agents of a foreign government?

Mr. GITLOW. Precisely.

The CHAIRMAN. And, of course, whose duty it is, as Communists, to use their position to further the interests of that foreign government?

Mr. GITLOW. And to take orders from that foreign government.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, in view of that situation and of the evidence before this committee, it would seem to the Chair that the duty of such labor organizations is to expel such members—not because they may have different political views; not at all, no more than because someone happened to be a Socialist, Democrat, or Republican; but because they belong to an organization that exacts obedience from a foreign government which has become a foreign dictatorship. So it would seem that this issue has got to be met sooner or later.

Mr. GITLOW. If we are to have bona fide trade-unions in the United States whose main purpose is to look after the economic interests of the workers who belong to those organizations, and where workers will have freedom of speech and discussion, and can act on problems on the basis of the intrinsic nature of the problems themselves, then it becomes necessary to root out the organized Communist activity within the union, because the Communists in the union do not act as individual members in the union, but they act as an organized bloc, as a fraction within that union. All policies, all measures taken in the union by this block are dictated by the Communist Party, which gets its orders from Moscow. And whether they believe in what the decisions are, or do not, they must carry them out.

And the result is you have this organized bloc functioning in an organization where all the rest of the members act according to their own particular views and convictions, and the organized bloc, even if not so large can always prevail against the other group which act freely, according to their own judgment of what is best for the organization. And you will find in all unions where Communists gain control and begin to act as a Communist bloc in the union, that democracy ceases to exist in the union: workers' rights are ignored; they are not permitted to express themselves freely, and all kinds of terroristic actions are taken against the workers. And I think if we are ever to develop the trade-union movement, which is of such concern to the country, and serves as a valuable medium for the protection of the workers' interests in industry and other places, we must see to it that this organized group, this Communist unit which prevents the unions from developing properly and tending to their problem, is rooted out.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, you stated a moment ago—you explained the pattern by which the Communists gain control or dominate or operate their "transmission belts"?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes: we used to call them "bridge" organizations. Now they call them "transmission belts" or "front organizations"; but it is one and the same thing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You call them "bridges"?

Mr. GITLOW. "Bridge organizations." In other words, they form a bridge to the masses for the Communist Party. A front organiza-

tion is organized by the Communist Party in the following fashion: First, a number of sympathizers who are close to the party and whom the party knows can be depended upon to carry out party orders, are gotten together and formed into a nucleus which issues a call for the organization of a particular front organization which the party wants to establish. And generally after that is done a program is drawn up by the party, which this provisional committee adopts. Then, on the basis of this provisional program, all kinds of individuals are canvassed to become sponsors of the organization, which is to be launched in the very near future. A secretary is appointed, a provisional secretary is appointed before the organization is launched and in every instance in our day the secretary who was appointed was a member of the Communist Party, because the secretary has access to the letters and to the files and to the organization. And as president of the organization, we would put up some prominent public figure who was willing to accept the presidency of the organization, generally making sure that, if that public figure was one who would not go along with the Communists, he was of such a type that he would be too busy to pay attention to the affairs of the organization, and therefore would represent no problem to the organization.

On the committee that would be drawn together, a sufficient number of Communists and Communist Party sympathizers who will carry out party orders, was included, and out of this number a small executive committee is organized, or acting committee, which carries on the affairs of the organization, so-called, and this small executive committee, with the secretary, really run the organization. And this small committee and the secretary are the instruments of the Communist Party, with the result that when manifestos or decisions on campaigns are made, those campaigns are ordered by the Communist Party.

And when you go through the minutes of the Communist Party, you will find the Communist Party, in dealing with the front organizations, will make motions; they will move that the I. L. D. conduct a campaign for so and so; and move that the League for Peace and Democracy shall send an organizer into the State of Ohio to do that, and that, and who shall at the same time, after he does his work, make contact with the district organizer, and so on.

Then the party gets in touch with the secretary of this front organization, who is a party member, and informs her or him of the decision. It is then taken up in the small executive board and also the party committee and everywhere the works are well greased and well oiled. The Communists are good machinists and know how to mesh the gears and keep them well oiled.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In addition to taking care to see that the secretary of the organization is a Communist Party member, is it true that the Communist Party, through its affiliates, instructs all of its members to work on this, or that, or the other front organization?

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, of course.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is, every party member—let us say they have 100,000—is instructed by the appropriate party committee to work on this, or that, or the other front organization?

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So that the members are distributed through the "solar system"?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As it is sometimes called by the Communists—the front organizations?

Mr. GITLOW. The membership is distributed in all those front organizations; at the same time, all members working in the front organizations obtain detailed instructions of how they should carry on their activities, and one of the main activities in the front organization is to try to draw from the front organization people into the Communist Party, so that they become disciplined by the Communist Party and become members of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. With the procedure and organization control you have just described, it would be easy for the Communist Party to absolutely dominate and control a large front organization with a very small number of Communists in the organizations?

Mr. GITLOW. The very nature of a front means that you may have a front organization with a following or even a membership of a hundred thousand or more in the organization, but the organization is so constituted that it is run by this small committee and its secretary, with the result that the Communists can, through a mere handful, manipulate a very large organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. And with the members in that organization having no real knowledge that that is going on?

Mr. GITLOW. No; most of the innocents, as we call them, in such an organization, join out of sincere idealistic viewpoints. They believe that they are doing a good deed, for instance, by joining an organization that fights for peace; they have no idea that the leaders of the organization, or those that manipulate the leaders of these peace organizations, have no regard for peace whatsoever, that they are opposed to it, that they are carrying on a policy which is contrary to a peace-organization policy. But they believe sincerely that when they talked to this organization, when they introduced a resolution, or they put their names to a petition of this organization that they are really doing a good job, doing a good deed. They do not know that they are dupes in the hands of the Communist Party, the Communist Party utilizing their good intentions and their idealism for its own crass purposes.

Mr. VOORHIS. In the case of trade unions it is more severe, because in that case not only do the people in a trade or an industry feel that they want, for idealistic reasons, to do something, but they may find themselves in a position where membership in the union is the only way by which they can better their condition in the union, and it becomes then a more serious matter because it involves the livelihood of the worker.

Where the objective is union membership, when the union organization is being abused for Communist purposes, that is a very serious matter which may mean the loss of a job and impoverishment.

Mr. GITLOW. At the same time, there is another angle which in this critical situation must be seriously considered, and that is when a group controls a union they have access to the industry in which the union operates, and if they are connected with a foreign power they are in a position to do tremendous damage, if the Government is opposed to the foreign power which they represent. They can become a source of sabotage and espionage and do great damage to the interests of the country and its people, and from that point of

view Communist domination over trade unions becomes a very serious matter, which must be given very careful and very quick attention, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gitlow, certainly it would be to the best interests of the unions that this matter be thoroughly aired and that a decision be reached in reference to it.

Mr. GITLOW. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be of tremendous benefit to the unions in their future work.

As long as this general conviction is held over the country that certain unions are dominated by Communists, it hurts the unions themselves. Under those circumstances, what could cause or prevent the leadership of a union from wanting to cooperate and be helpful in an effort to get rid of that situation? That is the strange thing that is running in my mind.

Mr. GITLOW. Only one reason could be responsible for that, and that is that there may be a political tie-up, a union of forces to maintain power in the union, which depends upon the support of the Communist bloc in the union. You may have people who hold important positions in the union who want to maintain their positions, who feel that the only basis for maintaining those positions is by having the support of the Communists, because if the Communists should throw their support to some other forces they would lose their positions in the union.

Mr. STARNES. They are willing to play with the Communists to retain control?

Mr. GITLOW. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. But do you not think it is true that unless these Communistic elements in organized labor are exposed and the rank and file have an opportunity to cleanse their houses, it is liable to discredit the whole labor-union movement?

Mr. GITLOW. I think the quicker the thing is exposed and the rank and file given an opportunity to clean house, the better.

I am convinced that in all unions where Communists have gained a foothold there is great discontent and opposition to the Communists in the rank and file, and it is only by sheer manipulation of the unions by the Communists and those that work with them, that prevents the rank and file from cleaning house.

Mr. STARNES. It is the leadership in some unions who are willing to play with the communistic elements to retain their control?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course.

Mr. STARNES. They themselves are only a party to the crime of destroying democracy within the trade-union movement?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course they are.

Mr. STARNES. In that connection, Mr. Browder himself testified last week that there were no Communists to his knowledge that were in positions of national leadership or prominence in the A. F. of L., and he specifically stated that it was merely a minority leadership in that connection.

I want to say that last year the American Federation of Labor was most helpful to this committee, and some of its leaders came before the committee and gave us testimony to the effect that the Communist Party were trying to bore from within, and that they had fought unceasingly against that sort of thing, and wherever they had found

Communists in a position of leadership they had attempted to throw them out.

I believe that Mr. Green, Mr. Frey, Mr. Woll, and other leaders of the American Federation of Labor will appreciate an exposé of an organization working within their ranks, and I believe they will co-operate within their own membership in driving out these elements.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think there is great danger in this country that there are selfish employers who would like to create the impression that the leaders of the unions are Communists, and would like to brand all the unions as communistic, and to destroy them and prevent the effectiveness of their work?

So, do you not run into the danger, in dealing with those who are Communists and who are not Communists in positions of leadership, that efforts will be made inevitably to charge someone with being a Communist, whereas, as a matter of fact, he is not? Would not that be the greatest danger there?

Mr. GITLOW. There are two sides to this question.

On the one hand, I agree with you thoroughly that many employers and corporations will utilize every opportunity to charge legitimate, honest, bona fide trade-union men with being Communists, because they want to defeat their purpose in organizing the workers within their trade-unions; and, in the case of action like a justified strike, or some other such action, the men may be branded as Communists unjustifiably.

On the other hand, you have the action of Communists that every time you try to expose them or tell how they are working against the very interests of the members of trade-unions you have them calling that "red baiting."

The CHAIRMAN. And calling them labor spies.

Mr. GITLOW. So, on one hand the employer misuses the situation for his purposes, and on the other hand the Communists misuse the situation for their particular interest.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, do you know a man by the name of John Steuben?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I know that gentleman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Who was active in the strike in "Little Steel"?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know whether that is his real name?

Mr. GITLOW. Steuben is his alias. That is a very well-known German name; we have the Steuben Society. His real name is Rijack, and he happens to be of Russian birth. He is a short fellow, about 4 feet 6 or 5 feet, with a pompous voice, and impressed with his own importance.

In my time he played a little role in the Communist Party, not an important role, and how he can become important among the steel workers, I do not know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do know he has become important?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; I know under the name of Steuben he has operated throughout the country as a big trade-union man, but he does not know the first thing about trade unions; he has never worked in a factory. He has been a member of the Communist Party since he was 16 years old, and has held positions in the Communist Party, but has never worked in a factory in his life. He

has become a big figure for the Communists in trade union situations like that in "Little Steel," where brawn and muscle is involved in the steel situation.

Mr. MASON. He was a witness before the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee on the steel strike.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think the record shows that.

Mr. Gitlow, you said that the unannounced party objective of the Communist Party in its front organizations must be translated into a real, underlying objective with the understanding of the front organization. You said, for instance, that peace may be in the name of an organization which you have, and that by peace we have to understand possibly what the party is getting at.

Mr. GITLOW. We have to understand that the Communists are the greatest propagandists in the world, and they have taught Hitler a lesson about that, and the League for Peace and Democracy at the present time is the league for Russian-Nazi friendship and the non-aggression pact, and if the Russian troops should cross the Polish border, then the League for Peace and Democracy will say that the biggest advance of peace was made when the Russian troops crossed the Polish border.

The CHAIRMAN. I happened to run across a news item when this pact was first announced when Browder was quoted as saying that the Soviet-Nazi pact would help the Poles. That shows you how ridiculous it is, and that was over his own name.

Mr. GITLOW. And the League for Peace and Democracy said identically that thing; they explained it that way.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then, Mr. Gitlow, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the American League for Peace and Democracy should be known as the Russian League for War and Dictatorship?

Mr. GITLOW. That would be a good name for them. Or you could call them fighters against Democracy, or that they are fighters for dictatorships and fighters against democracy.

Mr. MASON. In that connection, I draw to the attention of the committee that last year certain Government officials in key positions were holding positions in the local branch of the League for Peace and Democracy, with some six-hundred-odd members.

We have discussed that in the testimony this morning; it seems to me that this committee right now should invite the officers of the local branch of the League for Peace and Democracy who hold important Government positions to come before this committee, or, if they refuse to come, to subpoena them and find out what their attitude is at the present time in connection with this nonaggression pact between Russia and Germany, and what they are going to do in case this Nation ever become involved in the situation. That, it seems to me, is very important.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, some of those people to whom perhaps Mr. Mason has reference are people as to whom I do not feel that their loyalty to the Nation ought to be called into question.

Mr. MASON. It is not a question of that; it is a question of determining whether their opinions have been changed since last year by the conditions that have occurred.

Mr. VOORHIS. I think that is all right; but would it not be all right to say that they should either come here or write a letter, whichever they prefer?

Mr. MASON. A letter, as has been stated before, should not mean anything to this committee. It seems to me their position calls for their repudiation of the objectives of the League for Peace and Democracy; and when attention was called to their contact and membership, they denounced this committee and were very bitter in their attitude toward the committee last year. They pointed out that they were members of the local branch of the League for Peace and Democracy, and they bragged about it and said they were putting on a campaign to double their membership as a result of this committee bringing out the fact that at that time that they were members, holding key positions in the Government. Their attitude, it seems to me, should be determined, and they should be asked if they are now willing at this time to repudiate the objectives of the League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. VOORHIS. I think in that connection you should distinguish between declared objectives and real objectives.

Mr. MASON. Absolutely.

Mr. VOORHIS. Because the declared objectives are very worthy.

Mr. STARNES. Is not that the entire objective in forming a united front in which you have certain desirable objectives?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; that is true in every united front. The united front has what we say are concrete long-term issues, long-range objectives, for which a party is organized. So you can have a united front on the question of getting an 8-hour day or a united front on relief or a united front for peace or for democracy.

But the Communist Party is out for one thing, and that is to get power in the Nation.

Mr. STARNES. And that power is for the international organization?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sure; for the dictatorship.

Mr. STARNES. When Mr. Browder testified in answer to my questions, he said he could not say, "My country, right or wrong," but would only go along when he thought it was right; and Mr. Browder will go along with the Communist International whether it is right or wrong or in conflict with the interests of his own country.

Mr. GITLOW. Surely.

Mr. VOORHIS. The question as to "Little Steel" has been raised. Would you say that the employers in "Little Steel" were working very hard for good relations with their workers in that industry?

Mr. GITLOW. No; I think the activities of the employers in "Little Steel" are to be condemned, and I think the Government should take definite action in "Little Steel" to create a situation where the workers can exert their right to organize.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, before we take a recess for the noon hour I feel that I must insist that these Government officials who are active in this local branch of the League for Peace and Democracy, especially those holding important positions both in the Government and in that branch, should be invited to appear before this committee and declare themselves on the matter, or, if necessary, we should subpoena them, because in view of this war and the possibilities of the war we ought to know just where we stand and where these Government officials stand. It places them in important key positions in this organization, and when sabotage and other things can be carried on I think it is a part of our work at this particular time to do that, and I insist that this be done.

Mr. VOORHIS. Have you in mind who some of those people are?

Mr. MASON. There is Paul Sifton, David Saposs, and a lot of others.

Mr. VOORHIS. Without going into any detail, or mentioning any particular matters, it seems to me if those men are going to be called before this committee with the idea that they are supposed to state whether they will engage in sabotage if the Government gets into war, it seems to me we would put ourselves in an entirely wrong position. I think if it is desired to ask those people to make statements of their positions with regard to these matters, that would be entirely proper, and I think after that has been done, this committee might consider anything they felt called upon to do.

But it seems to me the first thing that should be done should be the matter of assuming that men in positions of trust are worthy of it and would make a free and full statement about the matter rather than assuming that there is a possibility of the things that have been implied.

Mr. STARNES. I suggest that we take that particular question up in executive session. I have some very strong feelings about it that I do not care to express here.

The CHAIRMAN. If that is agreeable, and there is no objection, we will take that matter up in executive session, and take a recess at this time until 1:30 o'clock.

(Thereupon, the committee took a recess until 1:30 p. m. this day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

(The recess having expired, the committee reconvened at 1:30 p. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not see any necessity for an executive session with reference to the appearance of these six or seven hundred members of the local chapter of the American League for Peace and Democracy. I think I can state the situation that would be agreeable to the committee; that these officials be contacted and invited to appear for the purpose of advising the committee whether or not they are still members and active in the association; whether or not they approve of the real purposes of the organization; that that be done without any justifiable inference that the committee suspects them of disloyalty to the American Government; that the reason for inviting them is that in view of the situation that has developed here it would afford them an opportunity to present such views as they might see fit to the committee with reference to it.

Is that satisfactory?

Mr. MASON. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. STARNES. That is satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be done. You may proceed, Mr. Whitley.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, you stated this morning that you would go through the minutes of the various committee meetings and point out some further instances where Mr. Brophy's name appeared. Will you give us those now, please?

Mr. GITLOW. It evidently took Mr. Brophy a long time to decide when to send the letter, because my testimony dealing with Brophy was made on Thursday of last week, and evidently, as is Brophy's custom, he conferred with Communist Party officials to decide what type of a letter to send, and evidently the type—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Wait a moment. That is purely a conclusion. Let us be absolutely fair. I think we ought to strike from the record that part of your statement—"evidently"—

Mr. GITLOW. All right, but Brophy did call me a liar in his letter.

The CHAIRMAN. We want to be absolutely fair. You do not know that he conferred with Communist officials, do you?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, he denied ever having conferred with Communist officials, and he did confer with Communist officials, which the minutes I will read will prove.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. GITLOW. I have minutes of the trade-union committee of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party, May 23, 1927. I read from the minutes:

Comrade Johnstone reported that in his conference with Brophy he had promised to issue a statement along the following lines.

In other words, Johnstone had a conference with Brophy and Brophy promised to issue a statement along the following lines:

(a) Claiming that he was elected president of the union.

(b) Demand of the G. E. B. that a committee of five members be set up, two selected by Lewis and two by Brophy—this committee to select a fifth, to investigate the election corruption.

(c) That Brophy claim the election as a victory for the "save the union" program and that the strike be conducted along that line. \* \* \*

(c) That Brophy appeal to all local unions to investigate the general election and to report to him.

(f) That a paper be issued to take up the question of corruption, to criticize Lewis' strike policy, and to advocate a militant struggle, to set up relief committees, etc.

(g) That he immediately begin to organize a committee for the formation of a labor party.

(h) That he come to Chicago for a conference to lay basis for work.

And that ends the conference with the party committee. That is one. Now I have the minutes of the political committee of May 5 on the question of mining.

Report by Comrade Foster on the conference held with Toohey, Hapgood, Foster, and Brophy. The election outcome was discussed and Brophy is convinced that he was elected but that Lewis stole the votes. He proposed:

(1) That Brophy should issue a statement immediately claiming the election, sending copy to Lewis and to all local unions. (2) Give same statement to press. (3) He also agreed upon our proposal to build up a committee, preferably of prominent miners to carry on the investigation. (4) Prepare to make a claim in a week after the convention of district 2.

Motions by Foster:

(1) That the mining committee be instructed to prepare a draft of a statement to be issued by Brophy claiming the election for that office of the U. N. W. A.

(2) Undertake to have him take the initiative in making this claim.

(3) That the mining committee immediately begin to conduct an investigation through party and sympathetic sources in the various mining districts to unearth the fraud perpetrated in the elections.

(4) That copy of the vote of Lewis and Brophy together with the per capita tax of the locals shall be furnished to all D. O.'s for their district.

That is, the district organizers of the party.

That these D. O.'s should immediately elect a committee to investigate the situation in their districts—investigations to be made immediately and submit reports at once to the mining committee through the D. O.'s.

(5) That the mining committee take up the problem of developing a committee around Brophy to conduct the investigation in the campaign.

(6) That we work with this committee in the general sense of developing it into a broad opposition movement in the miners' union and attempt to bring it

into collision with the Lewis machine in line with the minimum opposition program at least.

7. In the U. M. W. A. through this committee we proceeded to develop sentiment against Lewis with the end of eventually calling an open conference of the U. M. W. A., provided the course of the movement would indicate that such a conference would be justified.

8. That this committee around Brophy function openly in the miners' union as a committee to investigate the elections.

9. The size and character of the conference, if such is held, to be determined in the course of the work.

The CHAIRMAN. Those minutes were transcribed immediately after the meetings?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course.

The CHAIRMAN. They are all properly signed.

Mr. GITLOW. All properly signed, all legitimate minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not see how you could have more convincing evidence than that.

Mr. MASON. That is right, but let us have the rest of it.

Mr. GITLOW (reading):

That the mining committee take immediate steps to get a left-wing paper in the field in the mining industry.

11. That we call these district committees in the recent elections together in the respective districts, canvass the votes, and wherever there is a plausibility of making our claims stand up, to claim the election and proceed on the same outline as for a national investigation but that in putting forward such claims they should be linked up with the general strategy of the situation and no such claims should be made without specific instructions by the mining committee.

They mean the mining committee of the central executive committee of the party.

Motions by Lovestone:

That we defer consideration of this until after we have built up the committee and seen its composition.

That we get in touch with Stev and have him demand a special meeting of the executive council of the miners' union, to which Brophy, Stev, and Brenan should be invited to come and open up the whole case there.

That as soon as the information is made public by Brophy that all our fractions have local unions adopt resolutions endorsing Brophy's claim and demand that Lewis step out; particularly those local unions where votes were faked, these locals should emphasize the situation in their own organization.

That we insist to Brophy that he stay in this country.

That we make further efforts insisting that he utilize the present moment for launching his progressive paper.

Mr. STARNES. Why did you insist on his staying in this country?

Mr. GITLOW. After the campaign he wanted to make a trip to Europe, and we said, in view of the fact that we are going to make a campaign claiming the election was stolen from him—that Lewis stole the election—it would be better strategy for him to remain in the country while this campaign was being developed.

Mr. THOMAS. This trip that he was going to make, to what part of Europe was he going? What was the purpose of the trip?

Mr. GITLOW. I think that was a personal trip that he had in mind to make.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you know where he was going?

Mr. GITLOW. I do not recall at this time.

Other motions:

That in the statement issued by Brophy claiming the election, we attempt to have included and in our statements on the matter a contrast between Brophy's

program during the election for the conduct of the present strike and the manner in which it was being conducted.

And now I have some more motions in reference—

Mr. STARNES. Was Brophy apprised of the action of the central committee and later of the political committee?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course. The statements he issued were all worked out, as you see here—all the policy, all the strategy, all the statements were worked out by the central executive committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. And he later followed the strategy laid down at these meetings?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. As I understand, those are motions that you were reading?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Were those motions adopted?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; those motions were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. These instruments were prepared immediately after the meetings. They are records of the meetings prepared immediately thereafter and properly authenticated, with the seal of the party, or whoever was in charge, right there. This was done right at that time.

Mr. GITLOW. Here are the minutes of the political committee of the central executive committee of the Communist Party, May 19, 1927 [reading]:

Motions—by Johnstone—that we select a committee of three to meet with Brophy.

That we instruct Comrade Jakira—

He was the organizer of the Pittsburgh district—

to get in touch with Hapgood and Brophy and select a committee of three to meet them.

On the question of the issuing of the paper under the leadership of Brophy, that we insist on sufficient representation on the editorial staff to insure our influence.

In other words, we were contemplating publishing a progressive miners' paper with Brophy as editor, and in getting up the editorial staff we wanted to make sure that enough of our Communist Party people were on to insure our influence and control.

Brophy was not, as I told you in the beginning, a member of the Communist Party, and never was a member of the Communist Party, but he was one who worked under the directions of the Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. Was that committee, in fact, appointed, that committee of three?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; surely.

Mr. STARNES. And they did get in touch with Brophy?

Mr. GITLOW. Of course. I reported the conference in the beginning, where Johnstone had had a conference with Brophy, and he went over with him the kind of a statement to issue on the election, and points of it, and so on and so forth.

Motion: That we try to convince Brophy of the necessity of getting out a mining paper within the next 2 weeks; that failing this, we issue a left-wing paper.

That is that. On the question of funds for the mining campaign, in one of my hearings I stated that the funds for the campaign to elect

Brophy president of the United Mine Workers of America, and the campaign which followed to save the union, the funds for this campaign came from Moscow. The matter was discussed in a report on trade-union appropriations by Foster, and a motion was made by Lovestone which was as follows:

That the Political Bureau takes cognizance of the following facts: These funds were sent and received here during the absence of Foster and Lovestone as members of the secretariat. These funds were sent through the regular channels and received as such. The information received during the absence of Comrades Foster and Lovestone regarding these funds was confusing. That the funds, however, were spent entirely for mining work and even far in excess of the appropriation. That the secretariat go over the accounts of mining expense from the time of receipt of the funds until today and to check up to see if any money has not yet been spent on mining or if any debts were contracted on the bases of this appropriation and that the secretariat take steps to meet the debts. The party takes note of the fact that almost all the debts contracted on the basis of the appropriation have already been paid.

I think that is sufficient evidence of the relations between Brophy and the Communist Party of the United States in the years which I have mentioned.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, are you acquainted with Mr. Sidney Hillman?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I think I should be acquainted with Mr. Sidney Hillman. I was a member of the same union of which Mr. Hillman was president; and for fighting some of the racketeers in the local union to which I belonged, Mr. Hillman expelled me from the union.

Mr. THOMAS. What union was that?

Mr. GITLOW. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the organization which Mr. Hillman presently heads?

Mr. GITLOW. That is the organization which he is president of at the present time.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is a C. I. O. affiliate?

Mr. GITLOW. That is a C. I. O. affiliate; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you tell the committee your experiences with Mr. Hillman and his relationship, if any, with the Communist Party during the period you were active.

Mr. GITLOW. Mr. Hillman's relations with the Communist Party do not present a fixed picture of friendliness with the Communist Party at all times, because there were periods in which the relations between the party and Mr. Hillman were excellent and at other times the situation was one of animosity, in which Mr. Hillman fought the Communist Party tooth and nail.

But, nevertheless, Communist trade-union policy, important Communist trade-union policy, is in a large measure linked up with Hillman's activities.

The year 1922 marks a year of great friendliness between the Communist Party of the United States and Sidney Hillman. Just prior to the summer of 1922 Hillman was in Russia; made a special trip to Russia, was in Moscow, and was interviewed by all the important Communist leaders of Russia, and also had a number of interviews with Lenin himself.

When Hillman was in Russia, William Z. Foster was in Russia, and Robert Minor was in Russia as the representative of the Communist Party of the United States. On many occasions important trade-

union matters were taken up in Moscow together with Hillman and the Russian Communist leaders.

You will recall that when Hillman returned from Moscow, he brought with him an agreement with the Soviet Government for the organization of a corporation known as the Russian-American Industrial Corporation, or the R. A. I. C. Hillman was permitted, through the agreement he concluded with the Russian Government, to sell shares in the United States for the purpose of raising capital to start clothing factories in Russia which would be equipped with American machinery and run by American methods to manufacture clothing for the Russian people.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America held a convention in the year 1922, and I was sent as a delegate by the party to that convention, for the special purpose of securing from the Amalgamated an appropriation of \$5,000 for the National Defense Committee, which was the defense organization of the party at that time.

Robert Minor, who was in Moscow when Hillman was in Moscow, was sent to the convention as the representative of the party to the convention; and William Z. Foster went to the convention as the representative of the Trade Union Educational League.

The editor of our Jewish paper, the *Freiheit*, Moissaye J. Olgin, was invited to address the convention—was a special guest of the convention. At that convention we had a large block of progressive delegates who were fighting in the Amalgamated for progressive measures, and in the progressive block we had a fraction of the Communist Party members who were the leading force in the progressive block.

All the Communist leaders—that is, Foster, myself, and Minor, the three of us—met with the progressive block continuously and with the party fraction as well.

The 1922 convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America dramatized the return of Hillman from Russia. The main speech he delivered was on his trip to Russia, and the outstanding achievement of that convention was approval for the starting by the Amalgamated of the Russian-American Industrial Corporation. But in the fight on the issues by the workers as clothing workers a conflict developed in policy between the progressive bloc and the Hillman administration. That conflict arose over the question of the standards of production. The Hillman administration insisted that the workers in the men's clothing industry should guarantee certain standards of production; the amount of production that the employers were to expect from every worker working in the clothing industry.

The progressive bloc fought against this, claiming that the standards of production were another name for intensifying the speeding up in the men's clothing industry. On this issue a tremendous fight took place, and there was a possibility of the progressive bloc breaking with the Hillman administration. Minor called a meeting of the party fraction, at which I was present, and William Z. Foster was present, to force them to come to terms with Hillman on this issue and to accept Hillman's proposal.

I had just been freed from prison at that time, on bail pending an appeal, and I took Robert Minor aside, as well as Foster, and I told both of them that the forcing of the issue, to force the progressive bloc to accept Hillman's proposal, when they felt so keenly their opposition to it, would be a very serious mistake. Robert Minor said:

We must do it, because there are bigger issues involved; and when we were in Moscow, and Foster and I discussed with Hillman the future of the trade-union movement in the United States, we had worked out a plan for building a tremendous opposition in the American trade-union movement, which, if successfully carried through, would give us control of the trade-union movement in America.

What was this plan? This plan, according to Minor, was the following: That Foster was to build up the Trade Union Educational League as the left organization, the extreme left organization, in the American trade-unions. At the same time a general-opposition movement was to be started in the trade-unions against Gompers by enlisting the progressives in a general movement of opposition in the A. F. of L. unions. Hillman promised that he would support the movement to bring together these progressives in a bloc against the Gompers machine in the A. F. of L. You will recall that at that time the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America was not inside the A. F. of L.; it was an independent union. Hillman's relation with the railroad brotherhoods was excellent in 1922, and he stated that if success could be made in developing an influential progressive bloc against Gompers in the A. F. of L., support would be thrown to that bloc by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and by the railroad brotherhoods; and then, with the left wing supplying the enthusiasm and the mass character to the whole movement, sufficient momentum could be organized to bring about the defeat of the A. F. of L. Then the other unions outside of the A. F. of L., the railroad brotherhoods and the Amalgamated, together with the progressives, could take advantage of the trade-union movement, and the whole complexion of the A. F. of L. and its leadership and machine be changed. And it was due to an understanding of this kind with Mr. Hillman that the progressive bloc was stampeded into supporting Hillman's policies in the Amalgamated 100 percent, and every opposition that was expressed at that time to the Hillman administration was fought by the Communist Party.

This is an interesting sidelight into Communist trade-union policy. It was Lenin's expressed view that in order to gain control of the American Federation of Labor, it was necessary to build an opposition bloc on as broad a basis as possible, that would be far divorced from the militant and revolutionary slogans of a left wing in the trade-unions, or of the Communists in the trade-unions, and that it was the duty of the Communists to work in the direction of creating such a bloc, because if the administration of the A. F. of L. could be smashed through such a bloc, it would give an opportunity to the Communists to entrench themselves in the trade-union movement and to become a real power in the American unions. And it was in this scheme of things that Hillman cooperated in 1922.

I have here a resolution which was adopted by the party and sent out to the party organization, which reads as follows:

Resolution on the broadening of the Trade Union Educational League and building of an oppositional bloc in conformity with the Communist International decision.

In other words, the broadening of the T. U. E. L. was one thing. That was direct Communist initiative. In addition to that, there was the important thing of building an opposition bloc, as the C. I. called it, in the American trade-union movement; and this policy was a basic

trade-union policy for America since the party became active in the trade-unions. And when you read the document that was given out, the general policies for it all, then you discover that the organization of the C. I. O., which came in later years, follows this general line of policy laid down by the C. I. in its demand upon the American Party that it take steps to organize an opposition bloc in the American trade-union movement.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, that pattern for proceeding was laid down and outlined even back in those early days?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Gitlow, do you mean by that to imply that the organization of the C. I. O. was controlled, and was not a spontaneous proposition?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, my opinion on that question is the following: My opinion was at the time the C. I. O. was organized, and is today, that the splitting of the trade-union movement by the C. I. O. was not a service to organized labor in this country, but a disservice, because it split the organized labor movement into two warring camps, and in a fight, a civil war in the trade-union movement, only the employers will benefit.

Mr. VOORHIS. Of course, that war has been the worst problem of organized labor in the whole country; I recognize that.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. That is not quite the question that I wanted to get at, though. I wanted to know whether, in what you had said, you meant to imply that the organization of the C. I. O. was a deliberately planned proposition—part of the same forces that were trying to get this thing done in 1922—rather than a spontaneous movement on the part of a lot of people who felt that they had to try to build a mass organization in some of the industries.

Mr. GITLOW. I am of the opinion that the Communists were instrumental to a very large degree in the organization of the C. I. O.; that the Communist Party, from the very inception, threw all its resources into the C. I. O. organization. If it was possible for the Communist International to spend as much money as it did in trying to break the Lewis machine in the United Mine Workers of America in order to gain control of the United Mine Workers' organization, then how much more money would the Communist International be willing to spend to get a situation in the American trade-unions where it could control three times as much as the membership of the United Mine Workers of America? And the Communist Party from the very inception of the C. I. O. has thrown its full support into the C. I. O. They have attacked Green; they have attacked every opposition to the C. I. O., and have accepted Lewis as the outstanding progressive leader in America, and forgotten all the campaigns they were conducting against Lewis up to that time.

And it is interesting to note, too, that Sidney Hillman, who in 1922 favored a policy similar to the C. I. O., was willing to take his union out of the American Federation after it had just joined the union, and was willing to go ahead with a split of the trade-union movement. And as far as general unionism is concerned, policies, and so forth, I think you will find very little in the C. I. O. to differentiate from the policies of the American Federation of Labor—very little. And, furthermore, on the question of organization, I think the liberal

attitude of the Government toward trade-union organization had a great deal to do with the organization success of the C. I. O., and not the special ability and wonderful achievements of Lewis in the C. I. O. organization.

MR. VOORHIS. Is it not true that in recent years Hillman has fought against Communist domination in the C. I. O.?

MR. GITLOW. I said that—not in the C. I. O., but in his own union, where the situation demanded it, in order to keep his own control, he fought against Communist domination, and has always kept the Communists in the position of a weak minority. But at the present time the Communists, who have for years in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America been fighting against the Hillman administration, calling it a racketeer organization administration, charging it with corruption and everything under the sun, today the same Communists are always rushing to the defense of the Hillman administration. They support Hillman 100 percent, and there is no Communist opposition to Hillman in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America today.

MR. THOMAS. It is not clear to me, Mr. Gitlow, why the Communists opposed Hillman's administration a few years ago, and now come to its support in every particular.

MR. GITLOW. Well, I am of the opinion that the Communists' interests in the C. I. O. are responsible for that. In other words, the Communists have secured important positions of power and leadership in the C. I. O. organization, and since Hillman is a leading figure of the C. I. O., and the C. I. O. is engaged in this struggle with the American Federation of Labor, they support the Hillman administration due to that fact.

MR. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, does that finish the discussion of Mr. Hillman?

MR. GITLOW. Yes, sir; surely.

THE CHAIRMAN. Right in that connection, I believe Dr. Matthews has something on the same subject.

MR. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

MR. MATTHEWS. Mr. Gitlow, did you bring out in your statement the relationship between the R. A. I. C.—the Russian-American Industrial Corporation—and the Friends of Soviet Russia?

MR. GITLOW. No; I did not.

MR. MATTHEWS. I have here a copy of the Worker of November 25, 1922. That was the paper which preceded the Daily Worker?

MR. GITLOW. Yes.

MR. MATTHEWS. This was published weekly?

MR. GITLOW. That was a weekly, and then became a daily.

MR. MATTHEWS. I have here one of many advertisements placed in the Worker by the Friends of Soviet Russia, which reads at the top:

#### THE F. S. R. ARMY OF 50,000 AND THE R. A. I. C.

There are 50,000 in the Friends of Soviet Russia. There are tens of thousands more Friends of Soviet Russia than this. But to now we have found 50,000 comrades and sympathizers who will, if given a duty, make a conscientious attempt to perform it.

The Russian-American Industrial Corporation (R. A. I. C.), organized by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers has issued an invitation to the Friends of Soviet Russia to assist in a campaign to sell a million dollars' worth of stock, the proceeds from such sales to be used to aid in the regeneration of Russia.

You stated on the stand the first day you appeared, I believe, that the Friends of Soviet Russia was a completely Communist dominated, organized, and controlled organization?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. About the disposition of whose funds there was some very serious comment you had to make?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In that the funds were not used in the interest of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but were used to organize the party in this country?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the issue of the Worker of December 2, 1922, is an article on the Russian-American Industrial Corporation which states:

President Sidney Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, who has just left Russia, has concluded an agreement whereby American investors in the corporation are guaranteed a minimum of 8 percent dividends, and also the full payment of principal by the Soviet Government.

Is that in confirmation of your statement on that point?

Mr. GITLOW. I just stated that before; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the Worker of December 16, 1922, appears an article entitled, "New York Call Knifes Russia."

What was the New York Call?

Mr. GITLOW. The Socialist paper.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The article begins:

We have often heard of the laudable initiative of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (the independent union of men's tailors) to collect a million dollars in America through a stock company known as the Russian-American Industrial Corporation, for the purpose of buying weaving and sewing machines and materials and to send them to Russia, there to be utilized jointly with the proper clothing organization in the operation of factories furnished by the Russian Government.

The yellow Socialists, who hate the Soviet Government more than the capitalists themselves, have tried to discredit that initiative and to make it fail, just as they have tried to defame and destroy every other undertaking of assistance to Russia.

Did you state that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, through its president, had taken the initiative in organizing this Russian-American Industrial Corporation?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And as you interpret the language of this article, Mr. Gitlow, is it a case of the Socialists versus the Communists in this matter of the Russian-American Industrial Corporation?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; that is a part of the general fight.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And on the side of the Communists in this issue between the Socialists and the Communists you have Hillman present as a supporter of the Communist policy in this matter?

Mr. GITLOW. He went further than that. At the 1922 convention Hillman gave a demonstration of his animosity to the Socialists by giving a large welcome to Ogin, who was the editor of the Communist Jewish Daily, the Freiheit, and doing the opposite for Abraham Cahan, who was the editor of the Socialist daily newspaper, the Jewish Daily Forward. The convention went further, I believe, and made a donation to the Freiheit. I am not quite sure, but I know a donation to the support of the Freiheit was made to the

extent of \$5,000; it may have been more, it may have been less; I am not sure of the amount; but according to my recollection that amount was donated to the Freiheit.

The Communist defense organization at that time received a donation of \$2,000; and there were many ways in which Hillman demonstrated his sympathy and support of the Communist movement and its activities at that time. Later on the friendship changed to animosity toward the Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the issues of the Worker which I have before me have scores of articles similar to those which I have read to the witness, in support of his statements.

Mr. STARNES. That was in 1922?

Mr. MATTHEWS. 1922.

Mr. Gitlow, there is here before me a letterhead of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, national headquarters, Washington, D. C., which lists some of the men about whom you have given testimony. Sidney Hillman is listed as chairman of the committee on legislation; Michael J. Quill, chairman of the committee on housing; James T. Carey, chairman committee on unemployment; Lee Pressman, general counsel. Sidney Hillman is listed as vice president, and James T. Carey as secretary. These appear to be a majority of the officers of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in its national office. Does the presence of these men's names on the letterhead bear out your several statements to the effect that the Communists have utilized to the fullest advantage their members, their friends, and their sympathizers in the conduct of the C. I. O.?

Mr. GITLOW. That is my general impression.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gitlow at this time has some additional data to present with reference to Communist trade-union policies and tactics in general. I would like to suggest that he be permitted to finish the presentation of that material, and then he will answer further questions, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GITLOW. I have touched on the question of the miners' campaign on a number of occasions—the Communists' attempt to capture the United Mine Workers of America. But the field in which the Communists gained their greatest influence was in the needle-trade unions, the unions engaged in the industries which manufacture clothing, men's clothing, women's clothing, millinery unions, and so forth.

In the needle trades the Communists have conducted successful strikes and unsuccessful strikes. After having dominated the New York needle-trade situation for a number of years, the Communists lost considerable control of their unions, and were directed by the Profintern to split away from the American Federation of Labor and organize the unions under the direct wing of the Communist Party: and so a national needle-trade union was organized at that particular time.

One of the important strikes which the Communist Party led was the fur workers' strike. Ben Gold was head of the New York joint board of the furriers. Associated with him was Aaron Gross. He had control of the joint board and most of the locals of the furriers' union in New York. In the year 1926 the fur workers went on strike, and immediately a committee was appointed by the party—

by the Central Executive Committee of the party—to meet together with the officials of the union who were party members to work out the strategy and tactics of the furriers' general strike of 1926; and I was the representative of the party during the working out of the policies and strategy of the strike. We have a whole set of minutes dealing with that situation. During the course of the strike the American Federation of Labor was critical of the manner in which the strike was being conducted, and it set up a committee of its own in an attempt to bring about a settlement of the strike. The Communist Party decided that if the A. F. of L. committee settled the strike then the A. F. of L. would be in a position to appear before the furriers and the workers employed in the industry as the real leader of the workers, and not the Communists in charge of the union.

So we worked out a strategy of opposing every effort on the part of the American Federation of Labor to bring about a settlement of the furriers' strike; and in opposition to that we worked out also strategy to force William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, to indorse and support the strike. And so we developed the policy that the furriers' strike was the beginning of a national movement for the 40-hour week, and we circulated all the unions in the United States with a resolution in favor of the 40-hour week. Of course, all the local unions came out in favor of the 40-hour week, and we had the resolutions they passed in our possession, and so forth, and we sent a resolution and a letter to the State federation of labor in New York, and to other central trade and labor bodies on the 40-hour week, and asked them to join in this campaign in support of the 40-hour week, with the result that on one occasion we got William Green to come out openly and definitely in support of the 40-hour week, and to speak in support of the furriers' strike, as a move for the 40-hour week.

The furriers' strike was settled by the Communist leaders of the furriers' union, and the terms of the settlement were a victory for the fur workers engaged in the fur industry; and this victory in the fur industry greatly increased the prestige of the Communists in the American Federation of Labor. The fur workers were affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and the Communists could point to the fact that the Communists were practical trade-unionists and could conduct a strike that culminated in a few months in a victory for the workers engaged in the strike.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did the Communists also lead these strikes?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. It was openly led?

Mr. GITLOW. Openly led by the Communists, but the development, that is, during the course of the strike, William Green agreed not to interfere in the course of the strike if the officials of the general strike committee, and that meant Ben Gold and Aaron Gross, the Communist leaders of the strike, would agree to investigate the strike activities after the strike was ended.

And behind the back of the party officials, under the direction of Gold and Gross, an agreement was made with Green that such an investigation should take place at the end of the strike.

When we heard about this in the party a meeting of the policy bureau was held in which Gold was sharply criticized for making such an agreement and steps were taken to put obstacles in the way

of an investigation of strike activities by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor.

In the meantime the American Federation of Labor had appointed Matthew Woll to conduct an investigation into the furrier strike activities. When the Matthew Woll report was published it was a condemnation of the manner in which the Communists conducted the affairs of that strike. The Matthew Woll report disclosed the fact that the strike executive committee spent the workers funds, that over a million dollars was spent in the conduct of the strike; that lots of this money was used to bribe police officers, to corrupt judges, and so forth, to obtain favorable decisions for Communist pickets in strike arrests, and there was general misconduct in the affairs of the strike.

We immediately instructed the officials of the furriers' union to denounce the Woll report as a frame-up against the furriers' union, as an attempt to snatch victory out of the hands of the furrier workers, and to defeat the general purpose for which they struck.

At the same time we appointed a committee to investigate the activities of Woll in the labor movement for the express purpose of building up a case which would prove that Woll was a corruptionist in the ranks of organized labor.

Steps were taken to hire Frank W. Walsh as an attorney for the union at that time.

The startling thing in the Woll report was that the report of Woll in large measure was true, that what he said about expenditures, the extravagant expenditures of funds and of the bribery of police and the fixing of cases, that all these things were true that were reported by the committee.

At the same time the furriers' strike is important from the Communist standpoint because it permitted the Communist for the first time to develop an organization which could carry out deeds of violence.

The strike was very militantly conducted. The bosses, through organizers, hired gangsters to beat up workers, to shoot workers, to cut workers; in opposition to this measure of the bosses we set up a defense committee made up of trade-unionists and members of the party who were able to commit acts of violence.

The kernel of this defence organization set up by the Communist Party during this strike were known as the "Greeks." The Greeks came from the Greek section of the union, and from the Greek section of the Communist Party. They were members of the Communist Party.

Another branch that aided in setting up this defense organization was the Italian section of the party, and as soon as the furriers' strike the Communist Party had established a defense organization, a corps of people who could go into any situation and fight and fight very ably and commit any acts of violence which the party wanted them to commit.

And this group was used not only in trade-union activities but later when we had the Trotsky break in the United States in 1928, when a number of members of the Communist Party, who had become Trotskyites, were expelled from the party, we organized an organization at home, with this defense organization, and when

meetings were held there were smashed heads, broken noses, people were cut up, and so forth.

This organization has been maintained as a threat, as an organization of terror within the Communist movement.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is known as the strong-arm squad?

Mr. GITLOW. The strong-arm squad of the Communist movement. That developed out of the furriers' strike.

Mr. WHITLEY. And such tactics have been pursued and continued down through the years since that time?

Mr. GITLOW. Since that time.

You must keep in mind especially that Communists are strong believers in the effectiveness of violence. While the Communists do not claim that a revolution in a country necessarily must be violent, nevertheless every Communist is of the opinion that when a revolution takes place, and the existing regime is to be overthrown, such overthrow can only take place through violent methods.

And Lenin wrote a book, which is considered one of the classics of the Communists, called "State and Revolution," in which he goes on to prove that while a revolution depends upon revolutionary conditions, nevertheless a revolutionary party must be prepared to use violence, and every form of violence in the party, in order to take advantage of a revolutionary situation to obtain power for itself.

And on a small scale that has been the attitude of the Communist Party in the trade-union field, and that it is not amiss to use force and violence in obtaining an economic advantage as well as to overcome the opposition in the organization, where they meet with opposition.

The next strike of the needle trade, following the strike of the furriers, was the cloak makers' strike.

The furriers' strike involved about twelve—from eleven to twelve thousand workers. The cloak-makers' strike involved about forty to forty-five thousand workers. It involved more workers, and our leadership was not as secure in the cloak-makers' field as it was in the furriers' strike.

Mr. VOORHIS. What year was that strike?

Mr. GITLOW. That was following the furriers' strike in 1926; 1927 was the cloak-makers' strike.

Before the outbreak of the furriers' strike there was a Governor's commission set up to review the conditions of the industry. The Governor's commission brought out certain proposals for the industry, and as all such commission's report generally concluded, the commission indicated a number of points for the workers and a number of points for the manufacturers, and there were some compromises on some other points, and the matter became the subject of negotiation.

The leaders of the cloak makers, the party members, were very anxious not to call out a strike and to come to a settlement in the negotiations. I remember that I wrote a number of letters to the national office of the party on the situation, in which I represented that we were on the eve of a strike and that if any way could be found to settle the strike, or prevent a strike, it would be an achievement for the party and another great aid in union organization.

However, we had at that time a situation in the party which prevented the Communist Party itself from settling without a strike. Our

leaders in the cloak makers' union were under attack in the party as right wingers, as Loreites, as people who were not militant enough, with the result that our leaders in the cloak makers' union were afraid to adopt a position against calling out the strike.

William Z. Foster at that time was in opposition to the party leadership which was responsible for the strike, and he took a very left position, and even though there was talk of the possibility of settling the cloak makers' demands without a strike, William Z. Foster raised a storm, and said the Communists in the cloak makers' union were afraid to strike against capital and the bosses, with the result that where a strike could have been avoided a strike took place.

As the strike developed, an opportunity for settling the strike became possible about 4 or 5 weeks after the strike was in duration. A number of conferences were held with manufacturers and a basis for the settlement of the strike secured. There was a meeting called by the C. E. C. textile committee, to meet with the Communist leaders of the strike, the trade-union officials who were Communists and who were leading the strike, and the question of the settlement proposal discussed. But at that time the leaders were afraid to accept a compromise proposal, and at that time the party officials wanted to come out in favor of a compromise proposal, and the result was that when it was possible to settle the strike the strike was not settled and was prolonged for many long months, with the result that the workers lost millions of dollars in wages, unnecessarily, and when the strike was settled it was settled on a basis that gave the workers much less than the compromise arrangement; in other words, they could have gotten much more before.

That was due primarily to the fact that the union was involved in internal trouble, the union leaders were involved in an internal political situation in the Communist Party, and because of that fact the workers had to pay the bill; the workers had to suffer in the end.

And this is important to keep in mind because when a political party interferes in the affairs of a trade-union when a political party runs the affairs of a trade-union, for the interest of the political party and not the interest of the workers, such a situation is bound to develop and is bound to become very costly for the workers.

And I think that this case cannot be stressed too much, what took place in the cloak makers' strike, following the cloak makers' strike, and the defeat for the union and showing the losses resulting from the cloak makers' strike, which ran into millions of dollars, and gave the American Federation of Labor an opportunity to set up an element in opposition to the Communists in the national trade-union movement.

What is true of that strike situation was true an even greater degree in the Passaic textile workers' strike which was organized and directed by the party, and every effort to bring about the only kind of a settlement that could have been brought about in Passaic, where the workers could have gotten some place inasmuch as they were organized and the question of union organization kept in abeyance and the Communists wanted to gain, in the Passaic textile situation, a number of things from such a strike with the result that the strike lasted for over a year.

And the reason it lasted for over a year was that the Communists were able to make the Passaic textile strike a national issue, to expose and dramatize everything that happened in Passaic with the result that relief funds flowed in through all relief organizations and hundreds of thousands of dollars came into possession of the Communists to maintain the fight behind a small number of people, that is, who were out in the fight.

And when the fight was finally settled it was settled because the American Federation of Labor stepped in, workers became members of the American Federation of Labor, Textile Workers' Union, the U. T. W. The United Textile Workers of America, to make the only settlement which was possible at that time. The Communists got out of the strike, agitation, tremendous propaganda, and the misappropriation of relief funds which were used for many purposes besides the purposes for which they were collected.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say, Mr. Gitlow, that is typical of the Communist strategy in strikes, to use them for Communist purposes and to advance their own interest at the expense of the workers?

Mr. GITLOW. Naturally; for the Communist every move that is made by the Communist is for the Communist organization; they organize for that purpose. The organization known as the League for Peace and Democracy is a front organization for a special purpose; it is a higher political organization, to an extent, because it deals with the present complex international situation and during this time the League for Peace and Democracy in making its campaigns and demonstrations, every Communist union will be tied up to that campaign for democracy whether it is advisable to do so or not, when you have a parade such as the nonaggression pact they get everyone possible to march in that parade. They do not always succeed but on other occasions they do; sometimes with the heads of the unions, and in fact, the rank-and-file of the unions do not know what it is all about; they simply take orders from those who are in control of the unions, and so they use, in every political campaign of the party, wherever they can, they utilize the unions they control for party purposes; wherever they can that is done, because in the eyes of the Communist the party is the important thing; the union and other organizations are secondary to the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is just a means to an end?

Mr. GITLOW. Just a means to an end.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gitlow, you have mentioned these various strikes and described the part played by the Communists in them. It is a fact, is it not, that there was justification for every one of those strikes?

Mr. GITLOW. There was justification for the Passaic strike; there was justification for the strike of the furriers, and there was justification for the New Bedford strike, which was a wage cut.

But there was no justification in that situation for the strike to have been prolonged when the strike could have been averted.

Mr. STARNES. There was no justification for prolonging the strike.

Mr. GITLOW. No justification for prolonging the strike in Passaic; there was no reason whatsoever for a prolongation of the cloak makers' strike when the strike could have been settled on a more favorable basis for the workers.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Gitlow, you mentioned the fact that in the cloak makers' strike there had turned out to be for the American Federation of Labor an element in the Communist Party in control of that section.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. I would like to ask you this question: It has been my distinct impression that the leaders of the International Ladies Garment Makers' Union had tried very hard, and I should say successfully, to prevent communistic influence in that union. Is that correct?

Mr. GITLOW. They tried for many years, but Communists gained an influence among the masses among the members of the union.

Mr. VOORHIS. I am talking about at the present time.

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, at the present time Dubinsky is doing everything he can to eliminate the Communists wherever he possibly can.

Mr. THOMAS. Is he successful in that effort?

Mr. GITLOW. Oh, I think, with minor exceptions of the International Ladies Garment Makers' Union is dominated by Dubinsky and that the Communists play a very small role in that organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow, if it is appropriate at this time and fits in with your discussion at this time could you give the committee a typical example of how the Communist Party aggressively goes into the unions to gain control, such as you illustrated this morning how they gained control of the front organizations? How do they gain control of the unions?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, in the trade-unions the methods are necessarily different because in the trade-unions the Communists go into existing trade-unions for the purpose of capturing the existing organizations. In other words, it is not to build new organizations.

Mr. WHITLEY. They do not start like they do in the front organization?

Mr. GITLOW. No: they do not start like they do with the front organizations, and naturally the tactics used are different tactics.

Generally in starting the struggle in the trade-unions the Communists began by building a left organization, which issues a program dealing with the problems before the union, and in this program dealing with the problems before the union they attack the administration for its failure to meet the problems and they raise certain issues for the union and certain demands, certain reforms, that the union should institute.

If there is corruption in the union they will advertise that corruption and charge it against the administration and they will use every opportunity to stir up an opposition against the administration for their own advantage.

In addition to that they will make contact with all opposing elements in the union on the basis of a common program; that is used as a front for that particular union, and they meet with these opposing elements and will work out a program for the union, and generally in working out a program for the union the Communists come to an agreement on the jobs in the union. In other words, how the executive members on the body should be divided up, how many Communists should be given certain positions: that is, who should be the president, the secretary-treasurer, who shall be sergeant-at-arms, and so on.

In other words, the whole deal is made behind this program based upon issues before the union and how the spoils in the union are to be divided.

Then, a campaign is started, and as the result of that campaign they may gain the upper hand and may gain control of that local union.

Then immediately the Communists begin to see that their members in the union are placed in strategic places, jobs, regarding those who have supported them; those who have supported them are given good jobs and they build up in that way a machine to maintain their control of the organization.

And in practically every union in which the Communists gain control they gain control through that method; that is, a deal is made with the opposing party, and sometimes these deals were made with the most corrupt and most reactionary opposition element in the union.

For example, in the furriers' union, Gold gained control of the furriers' union when he made a deal with Sorkin and Wynick, who represented gangsters, and the racketeer element in the furriers' union, the very reactionary element. He had no understanding at all of the real purpose of the furrier trade-union, but in that manner he got control of the union, and after gaining control of the union the Communists usually take over the staff, put in the Communists, and control it.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the element that is opposed to him—

Mr. GITLOW. They either go along or get out.

So, that is what happened in the furriers' union. It happened also when Communists gained control of the New York Joint Board. They formed what is known as the joint action committee, the joint action committee of locals 29 and 22, and which is composed of the majority of the members of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union in New York.

And they made up the union front which opposed that element, and they engaged in a campaign which resulted in the victory of the joint action committee in gaining control of the New York organization, and that campaign cost \$122,000.

This is the auditor's report, annual report.

Mr. WHITLEY. It cost the party that much?

Mr. GITLOW. No; it cost the union that much, under the Communist leaders, in the fight to get control.

The union had plenty of funds in the treasury at that time and those funds were utilized in forming this joint action committee and in conducting the fight to gain control of the organization in Greater New York, and that fight required an expenditure of \$125,000, or around that sum.

Mr. VOORHIS. What was the financial condition of the union after it was over?

Mr. GITLOW. After that fight was over the union was in not such a bad situation. But during the strike whatever funds were left—there were funds in the treasury, but they had a large sum to begin with.

Mr. STARNES. Did the Communist Party have anything to do with the textile strike in the Carolinas?

Mr. GITLOW. The Gastonia strike; yes. The Gastonia strike was instigated by the Communist Party and was linked up with the drive to mobilize the Negro masses behind the Communist Party. And at the end of 1928 and 1929 the Communist International insisted that the Communist Party must intensify its activities in the Southern States, and the Communist International looked upon the Negro masses as the colonial people in this country and they felt that the 11,000,000 Negroes constituted a reservoir, a great potential reservoir, and so they insisted in spite of all the difficulties entailed in carrying it out, that the Communist work in the South and its activities in the South must begin to develop these activities and as the consequence of the Communist activities we sent down organizers into North Carolina among the textile workers in the textile centers.

I was general secretary of the party at that time and we had a special meeting of the policy committee to consider the North Carolinian textile situation because we got a report that wage cuts were being contemplated in the North Carolinian mills and we worked out a program to send a number of organizers and we had to send only those organizers into the South who were American born and who could speak the language without an accent.

And we selected Murdock and Beal and others and sent them into the South to begin the organization of the textile workers. And as a result of that, the Gastonia strike developed, and you know the consequences of the Gastonia strike. There is no need of going into that, because, when the strike was in full force, I was in Moscow having my fight with Stalin at that time.

Mr. STARNES. Well, it would be a fair statement to say that they planned and engineered the strike in order to further their program?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; the same as we engineered the New Bedford strike and the Passaic strike. We also planned for some coal miners' strikes.

Mr. STARNES. Due to the native population there, you selected with care your organizers to go in there?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And you took great care to select American people who could speak without an accent to go into the South, so as not to arouse antagonism to them?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; that is true.

Mr. STARNES. And that was part of your spearhead down there to organize the Negroes in the South?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; surprisingly, however, there were very few Negroes employed in the Gastonia textile mills. That happened to be the paradox of the Gastonia situation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Gitlow, you just mentioned the Communist Party engineered and planned various coal strikes. Would you want to mention some of the coal strikes you have in mind?

Mr. GITLOW. There was the strike in the coke region of Pennsylvania. We engineered that strike. Then in the Illinois coal fields, where there was some break-away movement from the United Mine Workers of America, and then throwing a number of the United Mine Workers themselves into the strike. There were a number of local, isolated strikes in the local collieries in the anthracite region at one time, and the party made an effort to tie them up together,

to develop a general strike situation in the anthracite region. In other words, wherever it was possible for the party to engage in a strike activity or foment strikes at that time, we did it.

Mr. STARNES. Did you ever have any trouble in the Harlan coal fields down in Kentucky at the time you were secretary of the party?

Mr. GITLOW. No. We had some internal difficulties in carrying on the opposition movement in the southern Illinois coal fields, in which one of the members, Corbishley, was the leader.

The CHAIRMAN. You never have had any success in an industry where the men were well paid and had decent conditions?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, in the needle-trades industry, at that time the furriers were pretty well paid and had fairly decent conditions, and we had pretty good success there.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Gitlow, would you believe, from your knowledge of the set-up of the C. I. O. and the Communist influence in it, and the Communist leaders in it, it would be possible for the C. I. O. to purge itself of its communistic leadership at this time?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, if I had my—if I would have influence and if my opinion would be taken, I think the first necessary step to put the trade-union movement back on a trade-union basis would be unification of the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L.—of course, without the elimination of the A. F. of L. leadership, and the C. I. O. taking the place that belongs to it—and then you could work out a policy of putting the trade-union movement back on a trade-union basis.

Mr. MASON. Well, could the C. I. O., as a union of itself, without the amalgamation of the American Federation of Labor, at this time succeed in purging itself of its communistic leaders?

Mr. GITLOW. It cannot do it at present, because it has a struggle with the A. F. of L., a superior force, and it cannot reduce its strength by eliminating the Communists at the present time; because, to do that at the present time, the C. I. O. would be engaged in a war against the A. F. of L. and then would have behind the firing line another war against the Communists and, as a result, would be getting blows in front and blows in back, and the C. I. O. would succumb.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you any further material there to present, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I wanted, but I have mentioned that once before—the Transport Workers' situation and the C. I. O.—not the C. I. O. but the interests of the Communist International in this country. And I think at the present stage of the game that is very important, because nobody can tell what the future has in store for our country, and ocean transport is a very important arm of national defense, and whoever is in a position to cripple ocean transportation is in a position to give the Government very serious blows.

Mr. STARNES. And in that connection have you noticed already there is some difficulty in obtaining transportation the press dispatches indicate?

Mr. GITLOW. Well, I have not followed that up. I could not give an opinion on that at this time.

The Communist International and the Profintern have worked energetically to gain control of the water front and the ships that travel the high seas, and they have done so consciously, recognizing

the importance of control in this industry. And in the United States the one person who played a very important part in developing this organization work was one George Mink, who at one time was the national secretary of the International Seamen's Clubs.

The seamen's clubs were organized in every important port in the United States, in Canada, in the South American countries, in Mexico, in China, in Europe, and important ports of Asia. All over the world the Communist International spent thousands and thousands of dollars to secure the organization of the seamen's clubs as an entering wedge to the seamen's trade-union organizations and in order to gain influence among the seamen, and these seamen's clubs were sort of social and beneficial organizations for the seamen. When they landed in a port, they knew they could go to a seamen's club and they could find some social amusement and make contact with other seamen, procure mail, or have their mail sent to various ports all over the United States and all over the world, and, in that way, the seamen had some place to go to. And all of these clubs were maintained by the Communist International and formed the very important network, and these clubs were all used not only to provide those little services so essential to the seamen, but to counteract the Seamen's Institute and some of the religious and social organizations maintained on the water front, but they were also used for political purposes and for a wedge into the trade-union organizations of the longshoremen and seamen all over the world.

MR. THOMAS. Do these seamen's clubs exist today, too?

MR. GITLOW. No; they do not exist today, because the Communists have considerable influence directly in seamen's organizations at the present time—the Marine Transport Workers' Union and certain locals of the longshoremen, on the west coast particularly.

MR. WHITLEY. They have served their purpose?

MR. GITLOW. They have served their purpose, and they have gone out of existence when they served that purpose, but the entering wedge was once these seamen's clubs. And I am of the opinion as the result of this work on an international scale, covering every country in the world, the Soviet Union has a large network of loyal support on the high seas, and that is of tremendous consequence and importance to the military defense of the Soviet Union whenever it requires to use that influence. And, as I say, the one who played an important role in constituting these clubs was George Mink, and George Mink at the present time is an agent of the OGPU who travels to all parts of the world on very important missions.

In closing, I want to stress the following—that I have presented here, somewhat in the nature of a confession, the inside of the Communist movement in the United States.

I have been subpoenaed by this committee, and I felt that it was my duty to tell the truth, because I have radically changed my political views from being a staunch and ardent supporter of the Communist movement, one who was ready at all times to make any kind of a sacrifice for the movement, because I believed the movement was out to better the existence of mankind throughout the world. I have come to the conclusion that the movement will achieve the direct opposite, and I see that the developments in Russia are not unlike the developments we witness in Germany and the developments we witness in

Fascist Italy, and in every country where liberty is denied to the people, and autocracy and dictatorship take the upper hand. And that accounts for my break with communism.

Had the committee subpoenaed me before the signing of the Russian-Nazi nonaggression pact, in all probabilities I would not have testified for the committee. I had the impression, to some extent, that the committee was motivated by reactionary considerations and antilabor considerations. I think responsible for that, to a very large measure, was the propaganda against the committee which the Communist Party engaged in—propaganda which reached everywhere throughout the country. As I told you before, the Communists are very able propagandists. But in my association with the committee, I have discovered the members of the committee are sincerely interested in not doing a job that will be of a reactionary character and a basis for antilabor legislation and laws in this country, but rather to stamp out an evil in American life which is detrimental to the best interests of the country.

Furthermore, I am of the opinion that we cannot accept the Communists as a sincere political force in the United States. I could conceive of the possibility of a political force in this country which is of the opinion that the United States Government is not the kind of government that can work in the interests of all the people, and, for that reason, it seeks a change in the form of our Government and a different set-up and does so sincerely. That is a sincere political organization motivated by its own convictions. But the Communist Party of the United States is not that kind of an organization, because it is an organization which is part of a military machine which takes its orders from abroad and will commit acts knowingly against the very interests of the country and against the convictions of many of the leaders themselves. I say that such an organization functioning before the masses as an idealistic organization is a real menace, because it confuses the political atmosphere and creates situations where it is impossible for people to operate in the political arena honestly on the basis of their convictions and political beliefs.

Furthermore, the Communists claim that they represent labor; that they are primarily the exponents, the only exponents, of the real interests of labor and of the poor in the United States.

This also, in my opinion, is a fiction and not borne out by the facts, because if the Communists represented the interests of labor, and particularly the interests of the poor in this country, then in the one country where the Communists are in control and have power, there at least they should hold in esteem those who labor and the conditions of those who are poor and have nothing, and we find precisely the opposite; that in the country where the Communists are in control the workers have the least liberty, are treated worse than in any other country, are exploited far more than they are in the capitalist countries, and have no political liberty whatsoever; no form of democracy in any degree exists in that country.

If they take the position that this attitude on their part is forced upon them because they are an advanced principled regime existing in a capitalist world which is opposed to them, that they are being surrounded on all sides by enemies, that position, too, I believe, has been exploded; because if the Soviet regime claims to represent the

most advanced, the most principled, the most socially minded force in the world, how can it come about that a regime making such claims for itself can, at this late date, when the whole civilized world is being plunged into a war in which the victory of Hitler will mean the darkest reaction for the world—how can such a regime make a union with such a force of barbarism and reaction? That, I think, is the culmination of every argument in defense of the Communist Party.

We are not dealing with an idealistic form of organization; we are not dealing with a political organization; we are not dealing with an organization interested in the affairs of this country. And that being the case, I feel justified, and I feel that I have rendered a duty in appearing before this committee and presenting the truth as I see it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gitlow, I think your testimony is the most important testimony that this committee has heard, the most convincing, and that you have rendered a great public service in giving a frank and truthful account of your activities while secretary of the Communist Party and of your knowledge on this subject. I think you deserve to be congratulated because you have been frank and truthful and helpful to this committee in getting the facts. At least, I express that as my opinion, and I am sure the other members of the committee join in it.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Mr. STARNES. I have one question here I would like to ask Mr. Gitlow.

It has been testified by Mr. Browder and by Kuhn that the Communists have sought to penetrate our educational institutions and to dominate our intellectual life with the Communist philosophy. Can you now name for me some of the leaders in that particular movement of the party? If you are not familiar with those at the present moment, will you give me some of those who were selected for that purpose when you were active in the party?

Mr. GITLOW. I can give them to you later. I cannot think of them at this time.

Mr. STARNES. You get my question?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Both at the time when you were general secretary and the continuation of it?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. I want to know who was assigned to the task of organizing that particular group.

Mr. GITLOW. I could name two of the persons assigned to that task. One was Joseph Freeman, to mobilize the intellectual forces behind the Communist Party and the other was Betram Wolfe.

Mr. STARNES. And you will supplement that with the names of some of the leading colleges they were able to penetrate?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And some of the professors you had in that movement?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. And, of course, you probably have some personal knowledge of what has taken place in recent years?

Mr. GITLOW. I would not care to testify about what has taken place in recent years, unless I had actual knowledge.

Mr. STARNES. I am asking you for your actual, personal knowledge, particularly in and around New York, where there has been so much discussion.

Mr. GITLOW. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. One other question. Have you had time yet to prepare that list of progressive leaders in this country that led the Communist fight to organize or, rather, to bring the labor movement under the aegis of the Communist Party?

Mr. GITLOW. You have asked me that question before. I have that in mind, but I have been busy preparing current business.

Mr. STARNES. But you will submit that for the record?

Mr. GITLOW. I will submit that for the record.

Mr. STARNES. And we will thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand, Mr. Gitlow, you have a vast amount of other information, a very large and complete record of the activities of the Communist Party from the year 1920 or 1921 until 1930, and you will go through that and carefully recheck it and be in touch with our counsel, so that at a subsequent time you can reappear before the committee and give us this additional information?

Mr. GITLOW. Whatever additional information you desire; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. If you think that information is of sufficient importance to warrant it?

Mr. GITLOW. Yes; surely, I will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. And may I say also, in addition to what I said a moment ago, that I feel sure you have rendered a great service to labor and to the labor forces of the country, and the fears you entertained before, that you might be furnishing ammunition to the reactionary forces, is unfounded. In my judgment, I think what you have done is to render a very distinct service to the cause of true liberalism in this country, which in nowise can be associated with any movement that looks to dictatorship, which, of course, the Communists do, regardless of what they may say.

Are there any questions, gentlemen? Have you any other questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. WHITLEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess until 10 o'clock in the morning, and we thank you.

(The committee thereupon, at 3:20 p. m., took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 12, 1939, at 10 a. m.)

# INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

---

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1939

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

Present: Mr. Thomas, Mr. Mason, Mr. Voorhis, and Mr. Casey.  
Also present: Mr. Rhea Whitley, counsel, and J. B. Matthews, Director of Research.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Call your first witness.

Mr. WHITLEY. I will call Mr. Weiner.

## TESTIMONY OF ROBERT WILLIAM WEINER, FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, what is your full name?

Mr. WEINER. Robert William Weiner.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever gone under, or been known, by any other name?

Mr. WEINER. No; William Weiner.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your present address?

Mr. WEINER. 1027 Walton Avenue.

Mr. WHITLEY. Walton Avenue?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Residence or business address?

Mr. WEINER. That is the residence address.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that in Brooklyn or the Bronx?

Mr. WEINER. The Bronx.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your business address, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. 35 East Twelfth Street.

Mr. WHITLEY. When were you born?

Mr. WEINER. September 5, 1896.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where were you born?

Mr. WEINER. Atlantic City, N. J.

Mr. WHITLEY. Were you in the World War?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you married or single?

Mr. WEINER. Married.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever been arrested in the United States or elsewhere?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where have you lived in the United States, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. Well, mostly in New York and a couple of years in Chicago.

Mr. WHITLEY. What occupations have you followed, and where?

Mr. WEINER. Various occupations.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you name some of them?

Mr. WEINER. Well, for awhile I worked in a foundry in Chicago making shells.

The CHAIRMAN. What foundry was that?

Mr. WEINER. I think it was the Republic Steel.

The CHAIRMAN. Making what?

Mr. WEINER. Shells.

The CHAIRMAN. Shells for what?

Mr. WEINER. 1917.

The CHAIRMAN. During the World War?

Mr. WEINER. During the World War. I was a salesman for some time.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where were you a salesman?

Mr. WEINER. In New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. What type of merchandise were you selling?

Mr. WEINER. Just peddling.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other occupations have you had?

Mr. WEINER. I was a functionary of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. You were what?

Mr. WEINER. A functionary of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean an official?

Mr. WEINER. An official; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you become an official?

Mr. WEINER. Let us see—I became an official of the Communist Party as organizer in one section of New York around 19—, it must have been 1927 or 1928.

The CHAIRMAN. That is when you became an official?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you join?

Mr. WEINER. Join the party?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WEINER. In the early twenties.

Mr. WHITLEY. What official positions have you held with the Communist Party since you became a member of the party?

Mr. WEINER. One, as a section organizer.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where was that, in New York?

Mr. WEINER. In New York. Now, let me see—at present I am the financial secretary of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long have you held that position?

Mr. WEINER. I think since the latter part of 1933.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are those the only two official positions you have ever held with the Communist Party, section organizer and financial secretary?

Mr. WEINER. To the best of my recollection; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever been a member of the central or national committee?

Mr. WEINER. I am a member of the national committee at present.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long have you been a member of that committee?

Mr. WEINER. Since the last convention, 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever been a member of the political committee?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or the secretariat?

Mr. WEINER. No—secretariat, yes; because of the position of financial secretary, I am a member of the secretariat.

Mr. WHITLEY. At the present time?

Mr. WEINER. At the present time; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you have been financial secretary since 19—

Mr. WEINER. Sometime in 1933, I do not remember the exact date.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you get off that subject, let us develop a few more facts. You joined the Communist Party in 1920?

Mr. WEINER. Perhaps in 1921 or 1922.

The CHAIRMAN. Where were you living when you joined it?

Mr. WEINER. When I joined the party I was living in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. What business were you in when you joined the party?

Mr. WEINER. In New York? I think at that time, in 1921 or 1922, I was peddling.

The CHAIRMAN. You were a salesman?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; just a salesman, self-employed.

The CHAIRMAN. On your own selling time?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of the International Labor Defense?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The International Workers' Order?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. What position do you hold?

Mr. WEINER. President of the International Workers' Order.

The CHAIRMAN. You are president of the International Workers' Order?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, what other organizations do you belong to, or have you belonged to, in addition to the Communist Party?

Mr. WEINER. The International Workers' Order, for one.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long have you been connected with that?

Mr. WEINER. Since the inception of the organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what year was that?

Mr. WEINER. In 1930.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what official positions have you held with that organization?

Mr. WEINER. Member of the general executive board and, at present, president of the International Workers' Order.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other organizations have you belonged to?

Mr. WEINER. The Jewish Peoples' Committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEINER. No; just the Jewish Peoples' Committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that connected in any way with the Communist Party?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. An independent organization?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What position do you hold in that organization?

Mr. WEINER. Chairman of the executive committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is the president of that organization?

Mr. WEINER. Well, we have no president. The chairman of the executive committee is to all intents and purposes the president.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the name of that organization?

Mr. WHITLEY. He is chairman of the executive committee of the Jewish Peoples' Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that still functioning?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is still an active organization?

Mr. WEINER. It is still in existence; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has that been known as the Jewish Committee Against Fascism and Anti-Semitism?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is Mr. Ben Gold connected with that?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Ben Gold was the—I believe he was the first chairman of the executive committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other organizations have you belonged to?

Mr. WEINER. I am a member of the American Academy for Political and Social Science, if you can call that an organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you held any official positions in that?

Mr. WEINER. No; just a member.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you been affiliated with or connected with any of the subsidiary or affiliated organizations of the Communist Party; for instance, the Compro Daily Publishing Co.?

Mr. WEINER. No; I have not been connected in any official capacity.

Mr. WHITLEY. In any capacity at all?

Mr. WEINER. No; except as financial secretary of the Communist Party I am more or less connected with the official organ of the party, the Daily Worker.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what capacity?

Mr. WEINER. Just in an advisory capacity.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have anything to do with the finances of that organization, the publishing corporation?

Mr. WEINER. No; not directly.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you have not belonged to any other organizations than the ones you have mentioned?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is all?

Mr. WEINER. I think that is all.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your present salary as financial secretary of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEINER. \$40.

Mr. WHITLEY. \$40 a week?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any other source of income?

Mr. WEINER. Not at present.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Whitley, he says he has no other source of income at present.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you in the past had any other sources of income since you have held that position?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; in 1937, partly in 1938, I was connected with a travel agency, the World Tourists.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were connected with the World Tourists?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the Soviet travel agency?

Mr. WEINER. It is not the Soviet travel agency. It is an American travel agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Intourist—

Mr. WEINER. Intourist is the Soviet agency.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was your connection with the World Tourists?

Mr. WEINER. I worked for the organization, getting business. My connection with the organization was to get customers for the World Tourist and I received a salary of \$40 a week for that. I had some wide connections with members of various organizations.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who was the head of that organization at that time?

Mr. WEINER. The fellow I knew was Mr. J. N. Golos. He is the general manager and I believe president of the World Tourists.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who were the other officers of that organization?

Mr. WEINER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is Mr. Golos still president?

Mr. WEINER. I believe so; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long has he held that position, do you know—approximately?

Mr. WEINER. I would not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, as financial secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, do you have complete charge of all financial transactions and records of the party?

Mr. WEINER. Well, what do you mean, complete charge?

Mr. WHITLEY. Does everything pass through your hands—everything relating to financial matters?

Mr. WEINER. In a general way; not every detail. We have a certified public accountant who is our bookkeeper.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is that?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Max Kitses.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is the bookkeeper?

Mr. WEINER. He is the bookkeeper and, so to speak, inner auditor.

Mr. WHITLEY. But he works under your direction?

Mr. WEINER. More or less.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which is it, more or less?

Mr. WEINER. It is very hard to define. He is very much independent in many things.

Mr. WHITLEY. In matters of policy—

Mr. WEINER. In matters of policy he works under my direction.

Mr. WHITLEY. Under your direction?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. He handles the details and you pass on the policies—the financial policies?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you sign all of the checks or vouchers for the organization?

Mr. WEINER. I sign the checks. From time to time I check on the vouchers.

Mr. WHITLEY. You check the vouchers?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you personally have to approve all of the vouchers before checks are issued?

Mr. WEINER. That is the rule but we do not always live up to that.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the rule is that all vouchers for payments to be made by the Communist Party are subject to your approval, and then, if you do approve, you issue the check; is that right?

Mr. WEINER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, all of the financial transactions, the payments for various purposes, go through your hands?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the financial policies of the organization are subject to your direction?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are the highest financial officer of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What financial records are kept by the party?

Mr. WEINER. We have receipts, vouchers, all the requirements of double bookkeeping; I do not know what they are; a ledger, I suppose. I do not know whether we have a cash book.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, you keep, in accordance with the accepted principles of the double-entry system, a complete record of all the financial transactions of the party?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That includes all receipts and all disbursements?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the records show the source from which receipts are obtained and the individuals or organizations to whom payments are made.

Mr. WEINER. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that include cash contributions?

Mr. WEINER. Everything.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no money that the Communist Party receives for any purpose that is not recorded in your books?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And if any official of the organization receives any money for the Communist Party that is recorded, too?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where are those records kept?

Mr. WEINER. In the national office.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, what are the sources of income of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. WEINER. Well, by far the largest source is the membership of the party, their dues payments, and the contributions by, oh, thousands of people.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are those contributions solicited; is there a drive put on for them, or are they just sent in voluntarily?

Mr. WEINER. We have people who send in money, but most of the revenue is derived from collections, affairs, mass meetings.

Mr. WHITLEY. Organizational activities?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; for example, I came away last night from a meeting in Madison Square Garden, where 20,000 people jammed the Garden and gave some thousands of dollars—I have not checked yet how much—to support the party financially.

Mr. WHITLEY. Approximately how much revenue is derived annually from dues payments and initiation fees from the membership?

Mr. WEINER. I have some notes here that I can consult, if I may. For example, the first 6 months of 1939 the revenue from dues was \$52,492.75.

Mr. WHITLEY. The first 6 months of 1939?

Mr. WEINER. 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the revenue from dues for the year 1938?

Mr. WEINER. For the year 1938, for the entire year, we had \$65,763.61.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the income from contributions for the year 1939; that is, to date?

Mr. WEINER. I have a lump-sum item which says, "Donations, affairs, and collections, including contributions, \$57,199.58."

Mr. WHITLEY. That is for the first 6 months of 1939?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the income of the party from that source for the year 1938?

Mr. WEINER. We had from mass meetings and affairs, \$45,575.

Mr. WHITLEY. That comes under organizational activities. I am inquiring about contributions.

Mr. WEINER. The \$57,000 represents everything—organizational activities and contributions for the first 6 months of 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Organizational activities and contributions?

Mr. WEINER. That is right. I said donations, affairs, collections, everything.

Mr. WHITLEY. How are those items divided up for 1938, contributions and organizational activities?

Mr. WEINER. I have the report here which says collections and donations. I would have to check.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have a lump figure?

Mr. WEINER. I have it lumped, collections and donations, \$32,293.

Mr. THOMAS. Is that for all of 1938?

Mr. WEINER. That is for collections and donations. Then we have an item, "Mass meetings and affairs," \$45,575.43. It is close to \$78,000 for 1938, organizational activities and collections, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. \$78,000; that includes everything but membership dues?

Mr. WEINER. Membership dues and initiations.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have already given me the total figure now of the membership dues for 1938. That was \$65,763.61?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That makes a total income for the year 1938 of how much?

Mr. WEINER. A total income of \$191,772.27.

The CHAIRMAN. What about 1939?

Mr. WHITLEY. What about 1939 to date?

Mr. WEINER. To date I would not know, but I can give you the total income for the first 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. WEINER. \$113,146.08.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the income from all sources for the first 6 months of 1939?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you give me the total income from all sources for the year 1937?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; I can. I have the published report.

Mr. WHITLEY. If you can break that down for 1937 by dues and contributions and organizational activities, I would like to have it that way.

Mr. WEINER. Dues, \$77,116.67; initiations, \$4,427.97; organizational supplies, buttons, \$5,599.84.

The CHAIRMAN. That is contributions?

Mr. WEINER. Contributions, everything, about \$117,000, approximately.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is for contributions and organizational activities?

Mr. WEINER. Everything.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the total figure?

Mr. STARNES. You mean that is the total for the whole from every source?

Mr. WEINER. No; that is outside of dues.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the total for 1937?

Mr. WEINER. The total for 1937 was \$258,316.62.

The CHAIRMAN. Right in that connection: What are the dues now that are paid by the members? We have had that already, but just to get it before the committee.

Mr. WEINER. I have a schedule here of the membership book.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the average?

Mr. WEINER. The average dues are on the basis of the earnings of the members.

The CHAIRMAN. What are they approximately; what are the average dues? I believe Mr. Browder gave that to us.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; we have that in the record.

Mr. WEINER. I do not know whether I can give the average. The average must be between, perhaps, 40 and 50 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. Forty or fifty cents.

Mr. WEINER. I would not be too sure.

Mr. WHITLEY. There is a sliding scale.

Mr. WEINER. There is a sliding scale.

Mr. WHITLEY. Depending on the income of the individual member.

Mr. WEINER. I have a schedule here if the committee would like to see it.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is in the membership book?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. We have a copy of that book in the record.

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, Mr. Weiner, do the sources which you have named and for which you have given the amounts received for the years 1937, 1938, and 1939 constitute the only sources of income?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. For the party?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. They represent the total income from any source?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Not only for the party but they also represent all the income which any official uses for the party?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And that represents any money any officials of the party or anyone else would receive for the use of the party?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand what I mean?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. We want to get the information correct in the record, so I want you to be sure you understand the question. The question is whether or not anyone receives any money for the party that is not recorded, for which a record is not made by you.

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have the names of the contributors to the party?

Mr. WEINER. I have some of the names; I could not have all of the names; there are thousands of them.

The CHAIRMAN. In what instances would you fail to have the names?

Mr. WEINER. Where collections are made outside of New York, where thousands of dollars are taken up in meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. Cash collection?

Mr. WEINER. Cash placed in the plate.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not have any record of the names?

Mr. WEINER. I would not have the names.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would have the lump sum?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. You would have a statement showing the lump-sum collections?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And outside of New York the district offices would have the names of contributors?

Mr. WEINER. Not necessarily.

The CHAIRMAN. If there were any contributions in Chicago, for instance, you would have the name of the party there, would you not?

Mr. WEINER. Provided it is not a public donation.

The CHAIRMAN. Cash in a public meeting?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. But outside of public meetings any contributions made by any individuals or organizations, any outside of New York, would be a matter of record?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Whitley.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, does the Communist Party of the United States receive subsidies or contributions or financial income of any type from sources outside of the United States?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. If it did have, you would have—

Mr. WEINER. I would have a record of that.

Mr. WHITLEY. In your books?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Right on that point: You are testifying under your oath positively that you know the party has not, while you have been connected with it, received funds outside the United States?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Either directly or indirectly?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I don't know what you mean by "indirectly."

Mr. STARNES. Suppose that you receive money from some member of the party who received the money from outside the United States, say in the amount of \$1,000, \$5,000, or even \$10,000, any sum, and they bring that money in to you. That is what I mean by indirectly.

Mr. WEINER. Well, if they brought it in and did not state where they got the money I would not know.

Mr. STARNES. Then you are not going to make an oath here, before this committee, that you have not received and credited to the account of the party moneys that have been received from outside, either directly or indirectly?

Mr. WEINER. Well, to the best of my knowledge, I would.

The CHAIRMAN. You state that as a qualification; you mean that money could have been received and you would not have any knowledge about it?

Mr. WEINER. No; I did not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what is meant by the question, is it not?

Mr. WEINER. The question was if somebody received money, somewhere outside the United States and brought the money in without saying where he got the money I would not know.

The CHAIRMAN. That could be true, could it not?

Mr. WEINER. Anything could be true; anything could happen.

The CHAIRMAN. It could be true that money has been brought in from outside in that manner?

Mr. WEINER. But since I have been the financial secretary of the party I have received no money from any outside source, from any source outside the United States.

Mr. STARNES. Then you are not able, personally, and are not prepared to swear or testify under oath before this committee that the party within the United States, or any party within the United States has brought money to you that was not received outside the United States? You are not prepared to give an answer under oath?

Mr. WEINER. No; I could not answer that; I don't know. I am not prepared.

Mr. STARNES. So your answer is you do not know?

Mr. WEINER. It might happen that they did; my answer is that I have not received any money from outside sources.

Mr. STARNES. That is outside sources where the money was turned over to you directly.

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. But I want to get and this committee wants to get a positive statement on this question, whether or not you are prepared to state under oath that you know that no persons or organization has turned over money to you that they have received from outside the United States.

Mr. WEINER. I do not think that any human being can make such a statement.

Mr. STARNES. Then you cannot swear that no money has been received in that manner? That is very definite and very vital and

we want to know if you can make any statement of that kind, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; that is exactly what I say; no money has come to me, no one made a donation to the Communist Party outside of the United States.

Mr. STARNES. But you cannot swear that it did not come indirectly?

Mr. WEINER. I am not going to swear—

Mr. STARNES. But I want to get at it this way: That you might have received unknowingly, unwittingly, money which may have been received from outside the United States?

Mr. WEINER. I might have received some money gotten in a robbery or from some other source.

Mr. STARNES. And you might have gotten some money from the Soviet Union?

Mr. WEINER. I don't know; I might have; I wouldn't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has the Communist Party of the United States received any donations or contributions from representatives of foreign governments in the United States?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You can state that positively?

Mr. WEINER. Absolutely.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, to reiterate the sources which you have named previously: Are the only sources, to your knowledge, of income to the Communist Party of this country what you have outlined?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, of the contributions you have referred to approximately how many contributions are there to the party during the course of a year, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. Oh, there are at least hundreds of persons.

Mr. WHITLEY. Hundreds?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Large or small?

Mr. WEINER. Contributions running anywhere from \$10 up.

Mr. WHITLEY. Run up to \$10. What larger contributions would there be?

Mr. WEINER. \$1,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. \$1,000?

Mr. WEINER. \$1,500.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many \$1,500?

Mr. WEINER. \$1,000 to \$1,500; \$1,500 is about the largest, I believe.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is since you have been financial secretary?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. The largest contributions has been about \$1,500?

Mr. WEINER. Well, let me see; there might have been one or two larger than that.

Mr. WHITLEY. Well, how much larger were those that were larger?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I don't remember exactly, positively.

Mr. WHITLEY. Approximately?

Mr. WEINER. Approximately, about \$3,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. Approximately \$3,000?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You may have gotten one or two in an amount as much as \$3,000, but they range all the way from fixed dues up to \$1,500?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt you a moment?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say the number of contributions received have been as much as \$1,000 each; have you gotten many contributions as much as \$1,000 each?

Mr. WEINER. Not very many; only a few.

The CHAIRMAN. About how many; give a rough estimate.

Mr. WEINER. A rough estimate; about 12 or 15 people.

The CHAIRMAN. Twelve or thirteen?

Mr. WEINER. Twelve or fifteen.

The CHAIRMAN. How many gave as much as \$1,500?

Mr. WEINER. I mean the largest contributions, the total number would be about 20 people all together.

The CHAIRMAN. That includes those who have given as much as \$1,500?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; \$1,500.

The CHAIRMAN. And in that is also included those who gave \$3,000?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know those people?

Mr. WEINER. I know some of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they wealthy people?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; are professional; some are wealthy.

The CHAIRMAN. Some are wealthy business people?

Mr. WEINER. Business people, professional people.

The CHAIRMAN. Teachers; did any teachers give \$1,000?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Professors in universities?

Mr. WEINER. I would not know.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not know that?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Any business executives in that class of 20?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Any lawyers in that class of 20?

Mr. WEINER. I guess so; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that right?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Any doctors?

Mr. WEINER. Some; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. On the whole, would you say those 20 people were wealthy people? That is, they were not workers, were they?

Mr. WEINER. Not workers; workers haven't got that much.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you would class them as wealthy people?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are in sympathy with the party?

Mr. WEINER. In sympathy with the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. They believe in its teachings?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I do not know that; they are friends of the party; most of them are friends of the party.

The CHAIRMAN. Naturally, they would be in sympathy if they contribute; but they were not members?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. They were people who had been helping the party over long periods of time?

Mr. WEINER. Since I have been connected with it.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of them have been helping the party since you have been with it?

Mr. WEINER. Some; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of them, I mean.

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Whitley.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, how are the district finances of the party handled? In other words, aside from the national organization that you have testified concerning, has each district organization a separate set-up; how does each district organization handle its finances? Will you explain that to the committee?

Mr. WEINER. Approximately in the same manner the national office handled its finances. They have a financial secretary, or a finance committee whose task it is to plan the income and check the expenses; to contact people to make contributions, organize affairs, make collections, and so forth.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, is this classification a correct one: The head of the branch for a district collects dues from the members in his branch?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And he keeps out a part of the collection for the operation of his branch?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What percentage does he keep out to carry out the branch organization activities?

Mr. WEINER. I really do not remember. We have that in the book.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you tell us how much?

Mr. WEINER. I think 20 percent; I am not sure.

Mr. WHITLEY. He keeps out a certain percentage?

Mr. WEINER. A certain percentage; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of the dues collected from his branch members to carry on the financial operations of the district branch?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And then he sends the balance to the section organization, if there is a section in that district?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. The section organization takes out a certain percentage to carry on the expenses of that section, to meet the expenses of the organization?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And then sends the balance—

Mr. WEINER (interposing). To the State organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. To carry on the activities of the district and sends it to the State organization?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, the district organization in turn takes out a percentage, where there is a district organization.

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. To carry on the activities of the district and sends the balance to national headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is an accurate description?

Mr. WEINER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of the manner in which the finances come to the national headquarters from the party members?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Right there: Suppose the branch gets a contribution, does the branch keep that contribution?

Mr. WEINER. They may, but ordinarily they send a certain percentage of it to the subdivisions of the party, including the national office.

Here is a blank of the form for dues reports which shows how the thing is worked out, if you are interested.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WEINER. I will leave that for you.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what percentage of the dues collected, eventually after passing through the various smaller units of the organization, get to national headquarters, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. What percentage?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WEINER. I would have to look that up.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know what percentage?

Mr. WEINER. I can't remember that. The book tells what it is; it is kept in the membership book.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not recall even approximately what percentage the national headquarters get?

Mr. WEINER. Let me see—I think it is 20—no, 30 percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. Thirty percent?

Mr. WEINER. I think it is 30.

Mr. WHITLEY. That gets to the national headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is of the money collected as dues?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the source of the income for the years 1937, 1938, and the first 6 months of 1939?

Mr. WEINER. And I might also explain why the dues for 1937 were different. The party membership was smaller; the total sum for dues was larger because since 1937 we have reduced the dues payments, from the first on a weekly to a monthly basis and finally reduced the cost of being a party member.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was that because you were in such good shape financially that you were able to reduce the dues?

Mr. WEINER. Not necessarily because of that. We found that it was hard for the ordinary worker to pay that much dues and therefore we decreased the amount.

Mr. WHITLEY. To encourage membership?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Decreased the amount the members had to pay?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Suppose, Mr. Weiner, that an individual came to the leader or the head of a branch or of a section or one of the districts and said, "I am in sympathy with the cause, and I want to make a substantial contribution; I want to give you \$10,000."

Now, what would happen to that \$10,000 in the branch or the section or the district organization; would they keep it?

Mr. WEINER. No; I do not think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not think so. Do you have any provision covering that?

Mr. WEINER. Well, that has not happened since I have been—where a branch has received even approximately a contribution of \$10,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know where any such sum has been received?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where any section has received that amount?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Suppose a substantial sum is received?

Mr. WEINER. But we do have an arrangement with the State organization that the national office is to receive a certain percentage.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is that percentage?

Mr. WEINER. It varies; there is no hard and fast rule.

Mr. WHITLEY. Depending upon the amount of the contribution?

Mr. WEINER. The amount of the contribution.

Mr. WHITLEY. Let us say a contribution of \$10,000; what percentage would the national office get?

Mr. WEINER. They would get out of the \$10,000—depending upon the financial condition of the respective districts or the State—they probably would get \$500 or \$250.

Mr. WHITLEY. Probably would, but you do not have any set amount?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or rule for handling that?

Mr. WEINER. There is no hard and fast rule.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Suppose a contribution of \$5,000 is made; what percentage would the national organization get?

Mr. WEINER. Well, it is really guesswork. I presume it would get at least 50 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean you do not know, or is it determined through some method?

Mr. WEINER. It is determined on the basis of negotiation with the State committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Who determines that?

Mr. WEINER. The national organization.

Mr. STARNES. Who does the negotiating?

Mr. WEINER. That negotiation is usually carried on—

Mr. STARNES. I mean, who is the negotiator?

Mr. WEINER. I am the negotiator.

Mr. STARNES. You are?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, you have to decide how much contribution the national organization gets?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. From the district?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; there is an agreement with the leaders in the districts.

Mr. WHITLEY. It depends upon the circumstances?

Mr. WEINER. Depending upon the circumstances.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say that in every instance the national organization would get at least 50 percent of that contribution?

Mr. WEINER. Not always 50 percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would you say was the minimum they would receive, or the largest?

Mr. WEINER. Between 25 and 50 percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. Between 25 and 50 percent?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever heard of it getting less than 50 percent?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of a large contribution?

Mr. WEINER. The State organizations usually do not get many large contributions.

Mr. WHITLEY. I want to get to that in a minute.

Approximately what percentage of the total contributions do come through the State organizations; what is the largest and the smallest percentage?

Mr. WEINER. It is not very large.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not very large. What percentage of the total contributions for 1937 would you say came through the State organizations?

Mr. WEINER. 1937; I don't remember.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not remember that?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Could you give us an estimate?

Mr. WEINER. An estimate—approximately, I think about, probably, 15 percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. Fifteen percent of the total?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would be your best estimate of the total amount of contributions received by the party during the year 1938 that came through the district organizations?

Mr. WEINER. Well, you referred to every type?

Mr. WHITLEY. Every type of contribution.

Mr. WEINER. Not mass activities of the organizations?

Mr. WHITLEY. No; I am referring to contributions.

Mr. WEINER. Contributions?

Mr. WHITLEY. Just contributions.

Mr. WEINER. It would be small; it would be small; I do not know; somewhere between 5 and 10 percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. Five and 10 percent. And would the same percentage of contributions received during the first 6 months of 1939 hold true; the same approximate percentage?

Mr. WEINER. From contributions?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WEINER. Just about.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just about the same?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; wait a minute. The 1939 would be larger.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words more contributions were received directly by the national headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And it is an exceptional case where contributions of any size are made to the district or the section or the branch organization?

Mr. WEINER. That is right; the exceptional case.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WEINER. When any real large contributions are made.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a record of how much money your branch and district organizations have gotten during 1937, 1938, and 1939?

Mr. WEINER. 1937; the district?

The CHAIRMAN. The districts.

Mr. WEINER. How much money they received?

The CHAIRMAN. That they received and they did not send to you.

Mr. WEINER. No; I do not have that.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any way of estimating that?

Mr. WEINER. No way of estimating that.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be just a guess?

Mr. WEINER. Purely guesswork.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know whether they got as much as the national organization or more?

Mr. WEINER. I do not know that.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, what is the basis of the negotiations or some of the terms or conditions on which you negotiate with the branches or sections or districts for money that they receive for the party?

Mr. WEINER. Friendly and fraternal.

Mr. STARNES. Friendly and fraternal. That is the only basis?

Mr. WEINER. The only basis; and cooperation.

Mr. STARNES. You do not take into consideration the needs?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; we do.

Mr. STARNES. Of the branches and the districts?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; I stated that specifically; we do take into consideration the circumstances under which the branch and district and State organizations work.

Mr. STARNES. What other circumstances do you take into consideration?

Mr. WEINER. No other circumstances.

Mr. STARNES. No other circumstances?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Those are the only ones?

Mr. WEINER. That is right; the interest of the organization.

Mr. STARNES. It is done on a friendly and fraternal basis?

Mr. WEINER. And the needs of the national office; the needs of the local office and the needs of the national office.

Mr. STARNES. I see. I knew, in a negotiation, you would have to have some basis, some sort of circumstances, and I just wanted that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Whitley.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, according to this report form which you furnished me a moment ago and which I presume is the monthly report which the district or the State organization sends to national headquarters—

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. It indicates that 35 percent of the monthly dues go to national headquarters.

Mr. WEINER. Thirty-five percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. It indicates that 100 percent of the international solidarity fund goes to national headquarters.

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that 50 percent of the initiation fees go to national headquarters.

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I do not see any provision on this form for handling contributions.

Mr. WEINER. We have—I would like to furnish you the money cash statement. There are two different forms. This one [indicating] deals with national affairs, celebrations, mass meetings, and so forth.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is another form?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is submitted monthly by the State organization?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And this report comes in with the remittances every month?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, you have an item here covering donations. That means when the district organization or any of the smaller units receive contributions or donations they have to report that to national headquarters, and you undertake personally to carry on negotiations with them as to what percentage of that donation the national headquarters is to receive?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, you have listed on this cash report, monthly cash report, subsidies paid. What does that mean?

Mr. WEINER. Subsidies to the local, subdivisions of the organization. For example, the State organization might support a small section.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WEINER. That is the nature of it?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WEINER. Just as the national office may give a subsidy to some smaller State organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, in that connection, to what extent does the national organization subsidize, or have you subsidized the State organizations, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. In a number of cases, to quite a considerable degree.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you tell me how many State organizations, during the year 1938, had received subsidies from the national organization to carry on their activities?

Mr. WEINER. I would not know exactly without referring to the records.

Mr. WHITLEY. Approximately how much money?

Mr. WEINER. Approximately, possibly, about six or seven.

Mr. WHITLEY. Six or seven States—

Mr. WEINER. There might have been.

Mr. WHITLEY (continuing). Received help, out of 42?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words a number of State organizations are self-sustaining, financially?

Mr. WEINER. Many of them.

Mr. WHITLEY. From their percentage of dues?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And initiation fees?

Mr. WEINER. And affairs and collections.

Mr. WHITLEY. And affairs. Now during 1937 would you say approximately the same figure would hold true, that is, as to the support given by the national organization to State organizations?

Mr. WEINER. I think in 1937 we supported more—I am not sure; I am really not sure; I could not say.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would it be smaller or larger? Give your best estimate. Mr. Weiner, if you do not have the figure.

Mr. WEINER. I haven't got the figure.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would be your best estimate as to the number of them that had received help from the national organization during 1937; a large number or a smaller number?

Mr. WEINER. Not a very large number; but probably larger than in 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say 10?

Mr. WEINER. Probably 10.

Mr. WHITLEY. Probably 10?

Mr. WEINER. Ten or twelve.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would be the total amount if you do not have the figure, give us an estimate, of the subsidies from the national organization to the local organization, during 1937?

Mr. WEINER. That I am not in position to say.

Mr. WHITLEY. During 1938?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you did state that during 1938 headquarters had helped, financially, six or seven organizations?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have given them large amounts?

Mr. WEINER. You mean from the national office?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; that national office, the six or seven subsidized from the national office to the State organizations; were they \$50 or more?

Mr. WEINER. It is more than \$50.

Mr. WHITLEY. How much was it; \$1,000?

Mr. WEINER. Well, some of them, yes; as much as \$1,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would the largest be?

Mr. WEINER. The largest that I recall is about \$2,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. About \$2,000?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. The largest subsidy from the national headquarters to a State organization that was not self sufficient, financially?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. What State was that, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. I think that was the State of Alabama.

Mr. STARNES. That was 1938, was it not?

Mr. WEINER. 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, did that money go for this Southern Welfare Conference held in Birmingham?

Mr. WEINER. No; that money went to the party directly.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not the understanding it was to be used to finance this Southern Welfare Conference?

Mr. WEINER. No; it was not.

The CHAIRMAN. You state, of your own knowledge, that was not the understanding?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That the money was to be used that way?

Mr. WEINER. That is right; that is my understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose was that money to be used in Alabama?

Mr. WEINER. To maintain the Communist Party organizers.

The CHAIRMAN. To maintain the Communist Party organizers?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. In the work in and about Birmingham?

Mr. WEINER. In the work in and about Birmingham; yes.

Mr. STARNES. To whom was it sent?

Mr. WEINER. I presume to the district organizer.

Mr. STARNES. Who is the district organizer?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Rob Hall.

Mr. STARNES. Robert Hall? Do you know Joseph Gilder, in Birmingham?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. You don't know him?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. You did not send any part of that money to Joseph Gilder?

Mr. WEINER. No; I didn't.

Mr. STARNES. You sent it direct to Mr. Hall, you say?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. What was his given name—Robert Hall?

Mr. WEINER. Um-hum.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you know, as a matter of fact, some of that money was used to finance the Southern Welfare Conference?

Mr. WEINER. No; I don't.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you know your party had something to do with the calling of that conference?

Mr. WEINER. I don't.

The CHAIRMAN. You deny any knowledge of that?

Mr. WEINER. I deny any knowledge of that; yes; I deny any knowledge; I don't know anything about it.

The CHAIRMAN. You never heard it discussed in any meetings, central committee meetings, about this work of the Southern Welfare Conference?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You never heard it discussed?

Mr. WEINER. Oh, I heard it discussed; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Sure.

Mr. WEINER. In this sense—that such conference was held; that certain people have taken part in that conference.

Mr. STARNES. For instance?

Mr. WEINER. That Justice Hugo Black, I think, participated or made a speech, or something of that sort, and it was quite a progressive step in the South—such a conference. But, to my knowledge, the party had no direct connection with this conference and I have given no money to the support of this conference.

The CHAIRMAN. But you say you heard that discussion in the Central Committee?

Mr. WEINER. I heard that discussion in the office of the party and, personally, I talked to Mr. Hall when he was in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. You talked with him when you held the meeting of the Central Committee? Did not you discuss that?

Mr. WEINER. Not in a direct manner; no.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute; not in a direct manner. What do you mean; what kind of manner?

Mr. WEINER. In the course of making a speech somebody mentioned the conference, about evaluating the significance of the conference.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, you discussed that conference before it ever was called?

Mr. WEINER. No; that was after.

The CHAIRMAN. After it was called?

Mr. WEINER. No; after it was held.

The CHAIRMAN. And after it was called?

Mr. WEINER. No; after it was held.

The CHAIRMAN. You say there was not any discussion before it was held and after it was called?

Mr. WEINER. I have not heard any.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not hear any?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What date did you send this \$2,000 down there?

Mr. WEINER. I did not send \$2,000 in one lump sum; we sent a weekly subsidy.

The CHAIRMAN. A weekly subsidy?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Over what period of time?

Mr. WEINER. Over the period—oh, I guess about two or two and a half years.

The CHAIRMAN. Over a period beginning with what time and ending with what time?

Mr. WEINER. I would not remember the exact dates.

The CHAIRMAN. Would your books show that?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; sure.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no objection to surrendering all of your books to our auditor?

Mr. WEINER. No; I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. And the names of those contributors, also?

Mr. WEINER. No; I would not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not submit the names of those contributors?

Mr. WEINER. No; unless I secured the permission of each individual.

Mr. THOMAS. I don't understand what you mean—unless you secure permission of each individual. You are not ashamed of these contributors, are you?

Mr. WEINER. We are not ashamed of the contributors.

Mr. THOMAS. And the people who made them are not ashamed of them?

Mr. WEINER. I am sure they are not ashamed.

Mr. THOMAS. Then what is wrong in supplying the names?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I will tell you what is wrong. Those people are friends of the party. They have given the money in good faith. Now, in some of the proceedings of this committee, at least, it has been implied that these people, the Communists and their supporters, should be deprived of their livelihood—fired from their jobs.

Mr. THOMAS. Where can you find anything on that?

Mr. WEINER. I looked over the record, and Mr. Dies, chairman of the committee, in questioning Mr. Koose, of Michigan, said:

Now, you have been a resident of Michigan for quite a number of years. Why is it the employers there do not get rid of the Communists on their pay rolls; why do they continue to let them stay there and operate in their factories?

Another question was, "Why cannot you get rid of them; why cannot you fire them?" and then the same question of Mr. Clyde Morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. What about contributors; they are not members of the Communist Party. You said "sympathizers."

Mr. WEINER. They have a right to be afraid, because—

The CHAIRMAN. No; it does not say anything about contributors; that is speaking about members who occupy key positions in labor unions.

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what that is referring to; that is referring to those cases where the Communist is concealing his identity, who becomes a foreman or gets some key position in the union. That is what that referred to. But you are now talking about contributors, people whom you say are wealthy people.

Mr. WEINER. People who are well to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are contributing to the Communist Party.

Mr. MASON. I understand some of those contributors are very important-positioned people—people occupying important positions—and that it might be embarrassing for their names to be divulged?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. Then some of those people hold Government positions, too, don't they?

Mr. WEINER. Not that I know of.

Mr. THOMAS. They hold positions just in industry?

Mr. WEINER. In industry, and professions, and business.

Mr. MASON. And to divulge their names might be quite a shock, because of their prominence in the United States?

Mr. WEINER. Well, it might hurt them; I would not say it would be a shock.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not saying you won't give us that information?

Mr. WEINER. I am not saying I won't give you the information.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you would have to take it up with the committee?

Mr. WEINER. I would have to take it up not with the committee; I would have to take it up with the individual contributors and secure their agreement to that. Now it seems to me—

The CHAIRMAN. All right; now let us proceed. If you have to do that, you know you are not going to get their agreement, so that is equivalent to a refusal; because you know perfectly well they are not going to do it, don't you?

Mr. WEINER. No. I will tell you what I will propose, if it is satisfactory to the committee: For the committee to appoint a well-known, impartial man, satisfactory to the committee and the Communist Party, and I will be ready to turn over the names in strict confidence to this man, then both sides should rely upon the independent judg-

ment of this person. If the committee is willing to do that, I am willing to do that.

Mr. MASON. What is he going to judge, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. To judge on whether the sources of income are genuine, or not. I will put him in touch with these people, let him talk to these people, let him investigate the contributors, but not to make it a matter of public record.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, you have had those contributions from those who are not members of the Communist Party, have you not?

Mr. WEINER. That is right. I am talking about large contributions.

The CHAIRMAN. And you have had them from some very important people in the United States.

Mr. WEINER. Not very important people in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Very prominent people?

Mr. WEINER. I don't know how important or prominent they are, but they are people not members of the working class.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated a moment ago there were a number of them wealthy people?

Mr. WEINER. Somewhat wealthy, sure; otherwise they could not give big contributions.

Mr. STARNES. You said in the year 1938 you made that \$2,000 contribution, and you made it to Robert Hall. In what form did you make the contribution?

Mr. WEINER. Now, I want to make it clear again that we did not send \$2,000 to Alabama in one lump sum.

Mr. STARNES. That is true; but you said that in 1938 you made it.

Mr. WEINER. We have an arrangement with the organization of Alabama to send them a weekly amount to support their work, and we do that. It probably amounts to \$2,000 a year.

Mr. STARNES. It amounts to \$2,000 a year?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. That was the largest, you said; you sent it in 1938?

Mr. WEINER. We sent it in 1938, and continued sending this subsidy in 1939 also.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know Paul Crouch?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; I do.

Mr. STARNES. He is a Communist, is he not?

Mr. WEINER. I think he is; yes.

Mr. STARNES. At the present time he is in Birmingham editing the New South; is not that correct?

Mr. WEINER. I don't know whether he is editor, but he is connected with the New South; yes.

Mr. STARNES. You said a moment ago that Robert Hall was present at this meeting in New York and started to tell of your conversation at that time when the chairman interrupted you with a question. What time was he in New York, in 1938, to see you and other members of the central committee?

Mr. WEINER. As a matter of fact, he was twice in New York at a conference of the party.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. WEINER. I think once in May.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. WEINER. I think it was in May, or in the spring of 1938; and the second time in the fall of 1938.

Mr. STARNES. What month of the fall?

Mr. WEINER. I don't remember.

Mr. STARNES. It is only the past year, now, and was only last fall, just a few months ago. Was it before or after Thanksgiving?

Mr. WEINER. I really don't remember; that is the truth.

Mr. STARNES. Was it before or after Christmas?

Mr. WEINER. It was before Christmas.

Mr. STARNES. It might have been, then, between Thanksgiving and Christmas?

Mr. WEINER. It might have.

Mr. STARNES. That was about the same time that Paul Crouch was in New York in November of the same year, was it not, to make a report on this Southern Conference on Human Welfare?

Mr. WEINER. No; Paul Crouch was not there.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

Mr. WEINER. I don't remember Paul Crouch being in New York at that time.

Mr. STARNES. You don't?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. How much money did you give Robert Hall in May, or June, whichever month it was, in 1938, when in New York City?

Mr. WEINER. I did not give him any money whatsoever apart from the regular weekly subsidy.

Mr. STARNES. Did you make any contribution in the sum of a thousand dollars at one time during the year 1938 to anybody in the State of Alabama?

Mr. WEINER. I don't think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait, let us get that answer now and get it positive.

Mr. WEINER. I say, I don't think so.

Mr. STARNES. Will you swear that you did not do so?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I would have to consult my records, but I don't think we have given a thousand dollars. I will have to consult the records. I would not swear.

Mr. STARNES. Did Joseph Gilder visit you in New York City in 1938?

Mr. WEINER. Not me; no.

Mr. STARNES. Did he visit at headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. I don't know; I did not see him.

Mr. STARNES. Did you turn over any money to him at any time during that year?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the biggest contribution you gave to anyone in Alabama, who lived in Alabama, or for use in Alabama, during the year 1938?

Mr. WEINER. There is no biggest or smallest contribution; it is weekly payments that we make the party organization in Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. That was all?

Mr. WEINER. That was all.

The CHAIRMAN. That you gave to any source?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Or for any purpose in Alabama?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Did you make any contribution or give any sum of money to the I. L. D. in the year 1938?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. In what sum?

Mr. WEINER. Oh, small sums; perhaps—

Mr. STARNES. Did you make a contribution in the sum of a thousand dollars in 1938?

Mr. WEINER. No; I don't think so; I don't think it would amount to a thousand dollars.

Mr. STARNES. That is all.

Mr. WEINER. I am not sure.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, on the form which the district officers use to make their monthly financial report to national headquarters, there is an item on there, "Subsidies received for other organizations." Now, what does that item refer to?

Mr. WEINER. What is that—"Subsidies received"?

Mr. WHITLEY. It says here, "Subsidies received," and right under it, it says "for other organizations." What does that mean?

Mr. WEINER (after examining paper). Oh, well, that would probably mean the campaigns.

Mr. WHITLEY. For campaigns?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; such as election campaigns or any special campaign.

Mr. WHITLEY. That would be subsidies received by the district or State organization?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. For a special purpose?

Mr. WEINER. For a special purpose; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what was the source?

Mr. WEINER. From the national office.

Mr. WHITLEY. From the national office?

Mr. WEINER. Oh, for that matter—yes; that is right; it applies to the national office; that is right—the national office.

Mr. WHITLEY. Received from the national office for some campaign within that district or State organization?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Campaign, or for some special project?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, does the national headquarters make any subsidies or any contributions to the State organizations or section organizations or branch organizations for special purposes, such as trade-union campaigns, or for publicity? In other words, does it ever earmark a contribution or subsidy it sends to a State organization?

Mr. WEINER. Sometimes we do; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Sometimes you do?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And other times you just send a lump sum to bolster up the finances of the State organization?

Mr. WEINER. In most cases we organize it on a weekly basis.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what are some of the special purposes for which subsidies are sent to district organizations?

Mr. WEINER. Well, for example, the party was active in the campaign for social insurance. In some cases we developed special cam-

paigns, in some of the States, for this purpose, and from time to time the party would be called upon—

Mr. WHITLEY. For what purpose; that is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. WEINER. Social insurance.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is to say, the local organization would put on a local campaign or drive for a particular purpose?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. To accomplish some purpose the national headquarters is interested in?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. I wish you would develop this social insurance; that is a very general term.

Mr. WEINER. Unemployment insurance.

Mr. MASON. Oh, the special campaign, then, was to get across the unemployment-insurance law?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. MASON. Oh, that is a different thing.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, Mr. Whitley, will you develop some of the other purposes?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has the national committee, during the present year, made subsidies to State organizations for the distribution of the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Direct or indirect?

Mr. WEINER. Direct or indirect; no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you not know that the minutes of the Central Committee of the Communist Party specifically designate that the national headquarters would make such subsidies for the distribution of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. WEINER. No; I don't know. In fact, the whole thing was placed on a cash basis; the districts had to pay cash before they got the books.

Mr. VOORHIS. Just a minute. But the districts did get the books; is that right?

Mr. WEINER. Sure: they paid for it.

Mr. VOORHIS. They paid for the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. VOORHIS. But your testimony is to the effect you did not give them money; you gave them books?

Mr. WEINER. Oh, no.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Or distribution costs?

Mr. WEINER. Or what?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Or distribution costs?

Mr. WEINER. I don't know that—or distribution costs. What do you mean by that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The minutes will show.

Mr. VOORHIS. About how many of those books were gotten out one way or another, however they were gotten out?

Mr. WEINER. Oh, I think they printed 100,000.

Mr. VOORHIS. One hundred thousand books?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. And those books were sent out from the central office, bought by the local offices, and then given out to people in the districts; is that right.

Mr. WEINER. Then sold to people in the districts.

Mr. VOORHIS. And then sold to people in the districts?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. VOORHIS. About 100,000 copies?

Mr. WEINER. I think so; I am not sure about the number.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, how much money did you send to Texas in the past year or two to help the party down there?

Mr. WEINER. Let me see: I think we have sent about—in 1938?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; 1938.

Mr. WEINER. I can state only approximately, because I have not any records with me. Probably about \$1,000.

The CHAIRMAN. In 1938?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much in 1939?

Mr. WEINER. Perhaps the same amount.

The CHAIRMAN. \$1,000 in 1939; how much did you send down there for this recent meeting in San Antonio?

Mr. WEINER. Not a cent.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not contribute any money for that meeting in San Antonio?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Directly or indirectly?

Mr. WEINER. No. Indirectly I don't know whether we did. We did not send any money from the national committee.

The CHAIRMAN. As to these contributors you are talking about—sympathizers—is it not a fact many of those people who contributed did so because they were opposed to nazi-ism and they thought, or their purpose was, to help the Communist Party in carrying on this anti-Nazi fight?

Mr. WEINER. Well, for one thing, they were opposed to nazi-ism, otherwise they would not support the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. I say did you not have some contributors who, while they did not believe in communism, nevertheless felt the Communist Party was making a sincere fight against nazi-ism and they contributed?

Mr. WEINER. Perhaps.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, "perhaps" is not an answer. Do you know, or don't you know?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of instances?

Mr. WEINER. No; I don't.

The CHAIRMAN. Of people thinking that your party would be instrumental in combating nazi-ism?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And who contributed money when they were not Communists and did not believe in it?

Mr. WEINER. I don't know of such people who did not have any sympathy with the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. All your contributors are people who are sympathetic with the Communist Party?

Mr. WEINER. More or less sympathetic.

The CHAIRMAN. But for some reason do not see fit to be members of the party?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; some don't agree with everything the party

stands for, but like the party, the work of the party, the educational work of the party, et cetera.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, getting back to the matter of subsidizing for a specific purpose: You mentioned that that is sometimes done and gave one illustration, that is, subsidizing a State organization for carrying on a campaign with reference to social-security laws?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, for what other specific purpose has the party sent, has the national headquarters sent subsidies to the State organizations?

Mr. WEINER. Elections.

Mr. WHITLEY. Elections?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Within the State?

Mr. WEINER. Within the State.

Mr. WHITLEY. So that the party can carry on a vigorous election campaign?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And in what instances was that done; do you recall?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I would not—I don't remember now.

Mr. WHITLEY. You don't remember any specific instance where such a subsidy was made?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I think we have subsidized several States in the last election; in 1938, we helped some of our people to get on the radio to carry on a vigorous campaign. I think one of the States is Pennsylvania—yes; Pennsylvania.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the amount of that subsidy for campaign purposes?

Mr. WEINER. Probably \$100 or \$150 or \$200; it would not amount to very large sums.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would not be a large sum?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what instances has that been done—that is, a subsidy for campaign purposes?

Mr. WEINER. Election campaigns, you mean?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WEINER. A number of other States. I would not remember now. I can refer to the records and give it to you.

Mr. THOMAS. Right on that point, before you go on: Can you recall any other States on the Atlantic seaboard? I mention "Atlantic seaboard" because you mentioned Pennsylvania. You definitely recall Pennsylvania?

Mr. WEINER. Yes. I think we have given some assistance—a small sum—to the State of New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS. In 1938?

Mr. WEINER. I think so; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. For what purposes was that given in New Jersey?

Mr. WEINER. To enable the party to participate more actively in the election campaign.

Mr. THOMAS. In what campaign; in the campaign of who?

Mr. WEINER. In the congressional elections.

Mr. THOMAS. What?

Mr. WEINER. The congressional elections in 1938?

Mr. THOMAS. You did not have any candidate over in New Jersey in the congressional elections?

Mr. WEINER. I don't remember; I think we had some.

Mr. THOMAS. In 1938?

Mr. WEINER. In local elections, or to support progressive candidates.

Mr. THOMAS. Progressive candidates?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. In any other party?

Mr. WEINER. In any other party; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I see.

Mr. MASON. I would like to ask now if you can recall, in 1938, sending a subsidy to Illinois in the campaign?

Mr. WEINER. I don't remember; I am not sure. Illinois is pretty—it is very much self-supporting.

Mr. MASON. How would a special issue of 50,000 copies of the Communist paper published in Chicago be gotten out—by local support, or support from national headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. No; by local support.

Mr. MASON. By local support?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. You mean, in other words, your party will spend money to help elect someone who belongs to another party?

Mr. WEINER. Who is progressive, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean assume here is a Republican over here that you think is progressive, and a Democrat that you think is reactionary: You mean you would spend money to help the Republican?

Mr. WEINER. We would not spend money to give the Republican the money; if he is a true progressive, we support our party in that particular district to mobilize all of the possible support.

The CHAIRMAN. Behind him?

Mr. WEINER. Behind the progressive candidate.

The CHAIRMAN. And if it is a progressive candidate you like, you will spend money to try to elect him; is that right?

Mr. WEINER. To effect the unity of the people behind the progressive candidate, yes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that 50,000 copies of the Communist paper published in Chicago were circulated in my district in Rockford for the benefit of the Democratic candidate and in opposition to this man Mason who is on the Dies Committee.

Mr. WEINER. There you are!

Mr. STARNES. In other words, your party supports progressives or liberals regardless of the party label?

Mr. WEINER. Any person who is all right, yes.

Mr. STARNES. Any person who is all right; that is, your tactics are to support progressive and liberal candidates?

Mr. WEINER. As against reactionaries, yes.

Mr. STARNES. As against reactionism or reactionaries, regardless of party labels?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS. Do you go and ask those candidates whether they want your support, or not?

Mr. WEINER. No, we don't.

Mr. VOORHIS. In other words, it is purely a voluntary action on your part?

Mr. WEINER. Absolutely.

Mr. VOORHIS. And probably, in many cases, these candidates don't even know about it?

Mr. WEINER. That is right; in most cases they don't even know about it. In some cases they have opposed it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, for what other purposes has the party made specific or earmarked subsidies to State organizations? For campaigns in trade unions?

Mr. WEINER. Campaigns in trade unions; what do you mean by that?

Mr. WHITLEY. Well, the party is interested in gaining influence and control in a particular trade union in a certain State. Would they finance that State organization, so that they could carry on a more active campaign?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. They would not?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, you don't recall any other circumstances—

Mr. VOORHIS. Just a minute, Mr. Chairman, let us see whether they might help a certain group within a trade union that was carrying on a struggle, maybe, with that union in order to try to gain greater influence. Might you not help a group of that kind?

Mr. WEINER. No. That is left entirely to the membership of the particular union to fight out their own battles.

Mr. VOORHIS. You have never made such a contribution?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, does the national headquarters ever receive any subsidies from the district or State organizations?

Mr. THOMAS. Before you go on, Mr. Whitley, have you exhausted all those purposes, now?

Mr. WHITLEY. He states he does not recall any others other than the ones he has named.

Mr. THOMAS. You cannot recall any other one, then, can you, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. No. Well, election campaigns; special—

Mr. WHITLEY. You have mentioned that.

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. You have mentioned social security and election campaigns, and could not remember any beyond that?

Mr. WEINER. Just about election campaigns—national and local elections.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything to help the party?

Mr. WEINER. Anything to help the party.

The CHAIRMAN. When you think there is something to help the party, you subsidize it, don't you?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In 1938, what were the total subsidies from the national headquarters for these particular purposes you have enumerated?

Mr. WEINER. I don't remember.

Mr. WHITLEY. Approximately?

Mr. WEINER. I would not know approximately; I would have to consult the record.

Mr. STARNES. Will you set out from the record, refresh your recollection from the record, and then set out for us what it is, in the committee hearings here?

Mr. WEINER. I will.

Mr. BRODSKY. Now let me get straight what is this you want, so I can make a note of them.

Mr. STARNES. We want the amount of subsidies paid to the States and districts last year for whatever purpose, Mr. Brodsky, for the year 1938; the name of the State and the amount, and the purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, does the national headquarters ever receive subsidies of any kind from the State organizations?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the only funds that the national organization receives from the State organizations are the 35 percentage of the dues and 50 percent of the initiation fees, and a certain percentage of any contributions received by the State organizations?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. There is no special contribution or subsidy paid from State organizations to the national headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, Mr. Weiner, suppose the State organization holds a big rally or mass meeting and takes in a thousand dollars, what percentage of that would go to the national headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. That would depend upon the circumstances.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just as in—

Mr. WEINER. In every other case.

Mr. WHITLEY. As in the case of a contribution?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, you discuss it, take it up with them, and decide on the facts in the particular case?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. How much would remain in the local organization and how much would go to the national headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. That is right. We would take into account both.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what would be the average percentage of the income from such organizational activities that would go to the national headquarters? Would it be as much as 50 percent?

Mr. WEINER. In some cases: yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. The larger the amount received from such activity, the larger the percentage that would go to the national headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; the larger the State organization is.

Mr. WHITLEY. In that instance, would the percentage to national headquarters be more than 50 percent?

Mr. WEINER. I do not think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. That would be about the maximum?

Mr. WEINER. Just about the maximum: yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, I asked you a few minutes ago if the Communist Party had ever received any subsidies or contributions or financial income of any sort from sources outside of the United States, and you said it had not. Has it ever received any money from any

representative or agent or courier representing the Comintern or the Communist International?

Mr. WEINER. That is about the same question, and the answer is "no."

Mr. WHITLEY. The other had more to do with foreign governments; this has to do with the Communist International.

Mr. WEINER. The answer is still the same, "No."

Mr. WHITLEY. No receipts from that source at all?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, has the party ever sent any subsidies to Washington, D. C., for any purpose, general or specific?

Mr. WEINER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know?

Mr. WEINER. I do not know. I do not remember. I think Washington, D. C., is a part of the Maryland State organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is right.

Mr. WEINER. If any subsidies are given to Washington, that is given by the State organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. That would come through the State organization?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not recall that the national headquarters has ever sent a subsidy to the Maryland district earmarked for use in Washington, D. C.?

Mr. WEINER. No; I do not.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not recall such an instance as that?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, what is the annual budget for the national organization, approximately?

Mr. WEINER. Approximately around \$200,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is to take care of the expenses of the national organization?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have already described the sources from which income is derived in taking care of the annual budget.

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the principal sources of income is the contributions?

Mr. WEINER. No; I would not say that is one of the principal sources.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one principal source?

Mr. WEINER. No; I said that by far the largest source is the members' dues, from the members of the party. But, as a matter of fact, we are receiving money from large masses of people. Individual contributions do not amount to so much in the general run.

Mr. THOMAS. Take the meeting you had last night. You testified that the party probably received thousands of dollars?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. How much was the entrance fee for that meeting last night?

Mr. WEINER. I think from 40 cents to \$1.10.

Mr. THOMAS. You had 20,000 people there?

Mr. WEINER. That is right, and a collection was taken up.

Mr. THOMAS. A collection was taken up besides?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. What is your estimate as to the amount received last night?

Mr. WEINER. In the collection?

Mr. THOMAS. No; everything.

Mr. WEINER. Oh, I would not know; probably the net, both State and Federal, amounted to around four or five thousand dollars.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was that mass meeting conducted by the national headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. It was conducted by the National and State organizations; Mr. Browder was the principal speaker.

Mr. WHITLEY. How do they split the income from such a meeting?

Mr. WEINER. Well, that would be adjusted, I suppose, on the basis of 50-50.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that the usual basis?

Mr. WEINER. No; not in every case.

Mr. WHITLEY. At the big rallies in New York, are they usually sponsored jointly?

Mr. WEINER. Not at all times.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who sponsors most of them?

Mr. WEINER. The State, most of the time.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does national headquarters usually get 50 percent from a State-sponsored rally?

Mr. WEINER. From a State-sponsored rally we would get less than that; I think it is 25 percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. What do they get if it is sponsored entirely by the national organization?

Mr. WEINER. We get 100 percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. And if it is jointly sponsored you get about 50 percent?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the general rule?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. As to the matter of the average budget for a State organization, what is the average budget for a State organization?

Mr. WEINER. Actually there is no average. It depends on the size of the party organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the range? What would you say is approximately the lowest State organization budget?

Mr. WEINER. They are as low as four or five thousand dollars a year.

Mr. WHITLEY. And as high as what?

Mr. WEINER. As high as—I think in the case of New York I think it is about \$160,000 a year.

Mr. WHITLEY. \$160,000?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, that is the highest?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. When you say "budget" you mean the total operating expenses of your organization for the year?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the second highest State organization insofar as the budget is concerned?

Mr. WEINER. I think it is the State of Illinois.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is their approximate annual budget?

Mr. WEINER. I would not be sure, but I think it is probably around thirty or thirty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. WHITLEY. And New York is the highest?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; New York is the largest.

Mr. WHITLEY. Then they range around from \$35,000 down to four or five thousand dollars?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; maybe lower than that.

Mr. WHITLEY. Then the State organizations in financing their budgets have sources of income which are chiefly the sources you have mentioned?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. They are the same as the sources for the work of the national headquarters' operations?

Mr. WEINER. Approximately the same.

Mr. WHITLEY. Dues, initiation fees, contributions, and organizational activities?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe you said that, with the exception of five or six or seven State organizations, during 1938 they were all self-supporting?

Mr. WEINER. Probably 10 States.

Mr. WHITLEY. Probably 10 States during 1938 that did receive subsidies from the national headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, are all of these transactions of the Communist Party handled through banking institutions?

Mr. WEINER. Most of them are handled through banking institutions in 1938 and 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. What about 1937?

Mr. WEINER. 1937; I do not remember.

Mr. THOMAS. You must remember that; you are the financial secretary.

Mr. WEINER. I will tell you everything I remember. I think in 1937 we also did most of our business through the banks; in 1938 and 1939 I am sure.

Mr. WHITLEY. What percentage did you not handle through the banks during 1937, 1938, and 1939?

Mr. WEINER. In 1938 and 1939, I do not think we did any business, except very small amounts.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just incidental, petty cash?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; just incidental, petty cash; the rest was done through the banks.

Mr. WHITLEY. What about 1937? What percentage was done through the banks?

Mr. WEINER. I would not be sure.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your best estimate? You are the financial secretary.

Mr. WEINER. That is all right.

Mr. WHITLEY. If the amount of business in general done through banks was not very large, you would know about that?

Mr. WEINER. No; I do not believe it was very large.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say that the cash transactions not handled through the banks amounted to \$5,000 during 1937?

Mr. WEINER. It is very difficult for me to give an estimate.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say that was high or low, in your best judgment?

Mr. WEINER. I really do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would not know?

Mr. WEINER. I would not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would know, would you not, if the cash transactions during 1937 were as high as \$10,000? You would remember that, as financial secretary?

Mr. WEINER. I would remember what? I do not think they were as high as \$10,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say possibly between five and ten thousand dollars?

Mr. WEINER. Possibly.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. WHITLEY. The financial transactions of the Communist Party during 1937 not handled through banking institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. I rather understood Mr. Browder to state that that was a very large part.

Mr. WHITLEY. He indicated a considerable amount.

The CHAIRMAN. \$5,000 would be a trivial figure as compared with your total income.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the reason I was questioning Mr. Weiner more closely, because as financial secretary he says that during 1938 and 1939 all of the financial transactions of the party national headquarters were carried on through banking institutions, except a very trivial amount of petty cash, for office expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. My recollection is that that is in direct contradiction of what Mr. Browder testified.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is my recollection.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood Mr. Browder to state they had practically abandoned bank transactions and had been carrying on a large part of their business through cash.

Mr. WEINER. Maybe in previous years, but not in 1938 and 1939; maybe in 1935, 1936, and 1937, perhaps. I cannot be sure of 1937.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are positive that during 1938 and 1939, all except a trivial amount was handled through banking institutions?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. For 1937 you said that that amount was between five and ten thousand dollars.

Mr. WEINER. That is purely guesswork.

Mr. VOORHIS. How long have you been treasurer of the party?

Mr. WEINER. I believe since 1933, some time in the latter part of 1933.

Mr. VOORHIS. You would know what was done in 1935 and 1936, would you not?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was done?

Mr. WEINER. In those years we transacted our business in cash, to a large degree.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is when you would receive funds from any of the sources you have named—

Mr. WEINER. Would deposit them in a box.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would deposit them in a safety deposit box and pay your bills in cash?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And would not go through a banking institution.

During the years from 1933 to 1935, what percentage of the financial transactions were handled on a cash basis and did not go through banking institutions?

Mr. WEINER. I would say most of them.

Mr. WHITLEY. That takes care of the period from 1933 to 1935. How about 1935 and 1936; did the same thing apply?

Mr. WEINER. I think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. Most of the financial transactions were carried on a cash basis during that time; but about 1937, you are not sure?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. There was a change in policy taking place during that year?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were beginning to utilize the banks more?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not remember what percentage was handled in cash in 1937, and what percentage was handled through the banks?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you do say that the cash transactions in 1937 were possibly between five and ten thousand dollars?

Mr. WEINER. That is purely a guess.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is your best estimate?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are also very positive that during 1938 and 1939 all of these transactions, with the exception of a trivial amount—

Mr. WEINER. Most of the transactions.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have been carried on through banking institutions?

Mr. WEINER. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me you should be more positive. You are in charge of these books, and you say you are only doing about \$200,000 worth of business a year, or handling that amount. It seems to me you ought to remember much more accurately.

As a matter of fact, in 1938 it is true that practically all of these transactions were done in cash; that is true, is it not?

Mr. WEINER. I should say up to 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. It was all done in cash?

Mr. WEINER. Most of it was done by cash.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not have hardly any of it in a bank account at all?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You received the money in cash and paid it out in cash, and kept it in a safety deposit box?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you make any accounting to anybody?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; of course.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the exact amount of the receipts?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is all in your records?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you say that in 1938 and 1939 about \$5,000 was done in cash and the balance on credit?

Mr. WEINER. In 1938 most of the transactions were done through the banks.

The CHAIRMAN. Most of them? What do you mean by most of them, 90 percent?

Mr. WEINER. Probably 90 percent or more.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would you say it probably is?

Mr. WEINER. I am not taking care of all the details. There is a certain amount of money that the auditor or the bookkeeper is authorized to spend without consulting me.

Mr. WHITLEY. How much is the auditor or the bookkeeper authorized to spend without consulting you?

Mr. WEINER. First of all, there is certain spending items that he does not have to consult me about, such as wages, rent, and all these things?

Mr. WHITLEY. You would not pay your wages in cash?

Mr. WEINER. Sure, we pay wages in cash.

Mr. WHITLEY. But the money is deposited in the bank?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You draw it out of the bank in cash and then pay the workers in cash?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS. Why did you in 1938 and 1939 start doing business with the banks, when you did not do that before? What was the reason for the change in the policy?

Mr. WEINER. Only because it was more convenient.

Mr. VOORHIS. I can see that, but I was wondering why you did not do it before.

Mr. WEINER. We were afraid of the bank failures. We had lost money in the United States Bank in New York; and, secondly, the certified public accountant insisted that for purposes of a better check-up and control we had to do business through the bank.

The CHAIRMAN. Why, during all these years would you be doing your business in cash, putting the money in a safe-deposit box? What was the purpose of that? Was there anything you wanted to hide, as to what you were doing, or from where you were getting the money?

Mr. WEINER. Not necessarily; no.

The CHAIRMAN. Not necessarily—that implies that maybe it is true.

Mr. WEINER. No; we did not; that was not the purpose. I found this system—

The CHAIRMAN. You determined the policy?

Mr. WEINER. I do not determine the policy alone, but I found this system when I got there and continued it for several years.

The CHAIRMAN. When you got in there did you consult with any comrades about changing that system?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; I consulted with Comrade Browder.

The CHAIRMAN. Anyone else?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Just you and Browder talked about it there?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You just decided this thing about the way to handle this money in cash?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. And the reason you did it was because you were afraid of the bankruptcy of the banks?

Mr. WEINER. That was one of the reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the main reason?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That was in 1933?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. After the President had reorganized the banks of the country you were still afraid of them, after Roosevelt had taken this great step toward stabilizing the banks, you were still afraid of the banks?

Mr. WEINER. We continued the old system.

The CHAIRMAN. Be frank with the committee and tell us why. As a matter of fact, you had certain transactions you did not want to make a record of; is not that true?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not want it to be known where you were getting the money and to whom you were paying it; is not that the fact?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Your statement is that the only reason you put that money in the safe-deposit box was because you were afraid of the banks?

Mr. WEINER. Partly for that cause, and partly because we had an old-established system that we were slow in changing.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you that conservative? You do not mind changing when it is to your best interests?

Mr. WEINER. In some cases we are conservative.

Mr. STARNES. When it comes to handling money.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to see if we cannot get this straight. I want you to be perfectly frank with the committee.

Mr. WEINER. I am trying to be.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that you were using that money for purposes, whether legal or illegal, that you did not want any record made of; is not that true?

Mr. WEINER. No; it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. When you spent money in strikes—you did use money for strike purposes, did you not?

Mr. WEINER. I do not remember using money for strike purposes in 1933 or 1934.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you at any time use money if a strike was in progress, to help the strike along? Many times you used money to start strikes, did you not?

Mr. WEINER. No; we never start strikes because we are no trade-union.

The CHAIRMAN. You help it along after it is started?

Mr. WEINER. If it is a bitter struggle and we are in a position to help, we do help.

The CHAIRMAN. You have done that many times, have you not?

Mr. WEINER. I do not remember a particular instance that I could cite before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not remember of an instance?

Mr. WEINER. Which would directly help a strike.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you help in such cases? How do you spend money in a strike?

Mr. WEINER. We do not spend any money for exactly strike purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. WEINER. I do not remember using money directly for strikes.

The CHAIRMAN. But you said you did use money many times in strikes, to help a strike.

Mr. WEINER. To help a strike in what way?

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. WEINER. By helping tide over some of our own members in the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. But do you not have members who belong to the unions? Your members are members of the unions?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Why is it necessary for you to help those members? Do they not get help from the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O.?

Mr. WEINER. In many cases they were not getting any help.

I would like to finish my answer to your other question; you did not let me finish.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us stay on this subject for awhile.

Mr. WEINER. You did not permit me to answer your first question.

The CHAIRMAN. I am trying to get this point.

You say one of the purposes for which you extend aid is to help Communists to engage in a strike. You have said also that those Communists are also members of the legitimate unions?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Why is it necessary for the Communist Party to help those people when they get help from the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O.?

Mr. WEINER. In many cases the unions are not in a position to give any help to the workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you cite an instance since 1933 when they have not been in a position to help in strikes—in which it was necessary for you to come to the aid of the Communist members of the unions?

Mr. WEINER. I cannot cite any instance offhand.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not know, as a matter of fact, that the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. have been well able to take care of their members since 1933?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You are of the opinion that there have been instances in which the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. were not able to help your members in the union and you had to come to their help?

Mr. WEINER. In some cases—in many cases our assistance was considerable in the form of issuing special literature trying to bolster their spirit and calling upon them to stick it out.

The CHAIRMAN. You had to pay for the printing of that literature?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And for distributing that literature to the strikers?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In what other ways did you use money?

Mr. WEINER. In some cases—that is about the only form that I can think of at present.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. WEINER. Except that we would—

The CHAIRMAN. Up until 1938, when you extended that aid, you did it in cash, and in 1937 your aid was expressed in the form of giving greater assistance?

Mr. WEINER. In the form of giving greater assistance to our member Communists in that particular way.

The CHAIRMAN. It was done through cash?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; through cash, as everything else we would do through cash.

The CHAIRMAN. And the same way in political campaigns in which you were engaged, you were taking money out of a safe-deposit box and spending it to help someone that you thought was progressive; is that right?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. And your principal purpose in that connection was that you were afraid of the banks?

Mr. WEINER. No—that is one of the purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Was not that one of the principal purposes?

Mr. WEINER. One of the purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the main purposes?

Mr. WEINER. The main purpose was—I found a certain system there that I was slow in changing. That was my only explanation. I was afraid of the banks, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not have more confidence in the banks under the leadership of Roosevelt when he stabilized them?

Mr. WEINER. That is right; we did have more confidence.

The CHAIRMAN. But not enough?

Mr. WEINER. No; it took 2 or 3 years to gain full confidence.

The CHAIRMAN. Enough to risk your money in the banks?

Mr. WEINER. That is right. We have not got a very large amount to risk, so we are very careful.

Mr. WHITLEY. What banks did you keep these deposits in?

Mr. WEINER. The Amalgamated.

Mr. WHITLEY. And Sidney Hillman is president of that bank?

Mr. WEINER. No; he is president of the union.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he connected with the bank?

Mr. WEINER. I would not know.

Mr. THOMAS. Is he a director?

Mr. WEINER. Perhaps he is.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is the president?

Mr. WEINER. Adolph Held.

The CHAIRMAN. How many boxes did you have in the Amalgamated Bank?

Mr. WEINER. One.

The CHAIRMAN. Only one box?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What other banks did you have boxes in?

Mr. WEINER. The Chase National Bank.

The CHAIRMAN. What other banks?

Mr. WEINER. That is all.

Mr. VOORHIS. Who is president of the Chase National Bank?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Brodsky is telling me who is the president of that bank, Mr. Aldrich.

The CHAIRMAN. What other banks did you have boxes in?

Mr. WEINER. No other banks.

Mr. THOMAS. Did you have a box in the Manufacturers' Trust.

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. You did not have one in the Manufacturers' Trust?

Mr. WEINER. I do not remember.

Mr. THOMAS. You are not positive whether you did or did not?

Mr. WEINER. I do not think I had.

The CHAIRMAN. You do your banking business with the Amalgamated Trust, do you not?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the International Workers' Order do their business there?

Mr. WEINER. No; they do their business with the Chase National Bank.

Mr. STARNES. Who handles the money for the International Workers' Order?

Mr. WEINER. The treasurer of the organization, Mr. Schipker.

Mr. STARNES. You are not the treasurer?

Mr. WEINER. No; I am not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, were your books of cash transactions certified by a certified public accountant?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long has that been done?

Mr. WEINER. Ever since I have been in charge of the financial affairs of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Since 1933?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the name of the C. P. A.?

Mr. WEINER. Max A. Greenbaum.

Mr. WHITLEY. Were all of your financial dealings made public in any manner?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; we published statements for 1936, 1937, and 1938 in the Daily Worker, and they were also printed in some of the other press.

Mr. WHITLEY. You published annual financial statements?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. They set out all of your financial transactions for the year?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you hold any official position with the Daily Worker?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. As treasurer or otherwise?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, did the Communist Party ever make a direct contribution to the officers or to the treasury of any of the unions of the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O.?

Mr. WEINER. Officially, to the union?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; through its officers or through any heads of committees?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. It never made a direct contribution to the unions, either of the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O.

Mr. WEINER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, in what banks has the Communist Party of the United States had its headquarters' accounts since you have been treasurer?

Mr. WEINER. Chiefly in the Amalgamated.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any other accounts?

Mr. WEINER. There is an account in the Chase National Bank. It is a sort of personal account of mine for small incidentals.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those are the only two banks in which the Communist Party has maintained bank accounts since you have been financial secretary, are they? You know?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those are the only two. In what names are those accounts carried in the Amalgamated and in the Chase National Bank?

Mr. WEINER. In the Amalgamated in the name of William Weiner.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are there any indications on the account that it is a party account?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is just carried in your personal name?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many accounts does the party have in the Amalgamated?

Mr. WEINER. One.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that is in the name of William Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. As an individual. How many accounts does it have in the Chase National Bank?

Mr. WEINER. One.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what name is that carried?

Mr. WEINER. Robert William Weiner.

Mr. WHITLEY. In your personal name, with nothing to indicate that it is a party account?

Mr. WEINER. Nothing.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is a party account?

Mr. WEINER. Not exactly. It is partly my personal account; I use it for my own personal needs and for some exchanges.

Mr. WHITLEY. You kind of mix up your funds with the party funds in that account?

Mr. WEINER. In that account, partly.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that the general practice, to mix up the personal funds of the officers or officials of the Communist Party with party funds?

Mr. WEINER. No; it is not a general practice.

Mr. WHITLEY. Why is that account maintained in that manner?

Mr. WEINER. No special reason.

Mr. WHITLEY. No special reason, Mr. Weiner, but you just mix up your personal funds and the party funds?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Is that done with the full knowledge and consent of the party?

Mr. WEINER. No; I did not consult any one.

Mr. STARNES. Has this been drawn to the attention of the officers of the party?

Mr. WEINER. No; I do not think so.

Mr. STARNES. To the attention of the secretariat or the political committee or the central committee?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. None of them know the manner in which you carry this account at all?

Mr. WEINER. No; it is a small account.

Mr. STARNES. You carry all of these accounts, and the party does not know the manner in which you carry these accounts?

Mr. WEINER. Not the Chase National Bank account.

Mr. STARNES. They do in the Amalgamated?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Does Mr. Browder know that; did he know you were carrying them in that manner?

Mr. WEINER. I never told him so.

Mr. STARNES. Had you informed him?

Mr. WEINER. I never informed him.

Mr. STARNES. He has no knowledge of how you have been handling the account?

Mr. WEINER. I do not think he has.

Mr. VOORHIS. Do you sometimes put party funds in the Chase National Bank?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You said one of the main reasons for your continuing to handle it in cash after you got to be financial secretary was because you found an established system and you were slow to change it; is that right?

The CHAIRMAN. You said that one of the main reasons you quit handling the cash, or rather one of the main reasons you continued to handle the transactions in cash after you got to be financial secretary, was because you found an established system and you were rather slow to change it; is not that right?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You just hated to bring about an innovation; it was a custom, it was the system, and you wanted to stay with it, is that right?

Mr. WEINER. I would not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not know, as a matter of fact, that the party had had a banking account before you ever became the financial secretary?

Mr. WEINER. I guess they had.

The CHAIRMAN. You guess they had; you know they had.

Mr. WEINER. I do not, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not later find out that they did have a bank account before you became the secretary?

Mr. WEINER. I think they had. I never made any special inquiries.

The CHAIRMAN. You think they had?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you not, since you have become financial secretary, found out that the party had a banking account before you ever became the financial secretary?

Mr. WEINER. I have not found out that, no.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not found it out?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not know—

Mr. WEINER. My impression is they did have a checking account, but I never discussed it with anybody in detail.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not know that they had one in the Corn Exchange Bank? Have you not learned that since you have been financial secretary?

Mr. WEINER. No. What year was that?

The CHAIRMAN. 1929.

Mr. WEINER. I would not know that.

The CHAIRMAN. You do know that they did have banking accounts, do you not?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; I have a general idea.

The CHAIRMAN. Then why did you make the statement that the reason you continued the cash proposition was because it was the custom, it was the system?

Mr. WEINER. When I came in there was no checking account.

The CHAIRMAN. But you said that it had been the custom, it had been the system, and you kept on that way.

Mr. WEINER. That is the system I found when I came in, the cash system.

The CHAIRMAN. How long was it before you found out that they had a banking account?

Mr. WEINER. I never tried to find out. I heard at some time or other during the existence of the party that they had checking accounts. I do not know where they had them or when they had them.

The CHAIRMAN. They installed you as financial secretary and you did not inquire where they did their banking business?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You just went in there, they installed you as financial secretary, and you did not ask, "Where do we do our banking business?"

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not make any inquiry at all?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. STARNES. Are you under bond to the party for the faithful performance of your duties as financial secretary?

Mr. WEINER. I did not get the question.

Mr. STARNES. Are you under bond?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. You have never carried a bond covering your liability at all?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. As financial secretary?

Mr. WEINER. Never.

Mr. STARNES. To whom do you report on the amounts of money that you collect and disburse on behalf of the party?

Mr. WEINER. The certified public accountant renders a report—oh, about every 3 months.

Mr. STARNES. Is that certified accountant under bond?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. No member of the party who handles, collects, and disburses funds for the party in a national way is under bond?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. You make no written report of any kind to any governing body in the party in this country?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. You do not report to the secretariat nor to the Central Committee?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Nor the political committee?

Mr. WEINER. That is right; I do not report.

Mr. STARNES. And when they want to know anything about money they just have to ask you about it or take your word for it?

Mr. WEINER. That is right. They rely on me and on the bookkeeper, and on the public accountant.

Mr. STARNES. They have to accept your word absolutely and implicitly on the amount of money you have received and the amount of money you have spent or disbursed?

Mr. WEINER. They do not have to accept my word. They can refer to the receipts and to the books.

Mr. VOORHIS. But there is not any annual report made?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; there is a quarterly report, in fact, made by the accountant. A copy is given to the officers of the organization. Whether they study these copies or not, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. How much cash have you had handed to you since you have been financial secretary?

Mr. WEINER. The fact of the matter is, when I get cash I turn it over to the bookkeeper, and he is the one that pays out the money. I do not handle the details.

The CHAIRMAN. You handle the proposition of getting the cash?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, in some cases.

The CHAIRMAN. How much cash have you gotten approximately, to the best of your recollection, since you have been financial secretary of the party?

Mr. WEINER. Oh, well, you see the dues I do not receive. The secretary receives that.

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about cash handed to you.

Mr. WEINER. That is also cash handed to me; probably about forty, fifty, or sixty thousand dollars a year.

The CHAIRMAN. That much cash has been handed to you?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And when you got the cash, you handed it to the bookkeeper?

Mr. WEINER. That is right, and got a receipt for it.

The CHAIRMAN. You get a receipt from the bookkeeper for it?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you give a receipt to the person from whom you get the cash?

Mr. WEINER. In some cases I do.

The CHAIRMAN. In how many cases; half the cases?

Mr. WEINER. I should say in most cases I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you have a copy of the receipts, do you not?

Mr. WEINER. I have a copy of some receipts; yes. In most cases—in some cases here is how it works. If I get a contribution from an individual I give him a temporary receipt, and then when I turn over the money to the bookkeeper, an official receipt is issued, and then the temporary receipt is destroyed or is made invalid.

The CHAIRMAN. Destroyed?

Mr. WEINER. Made invalid.

The CHAIRMAN. But you keep a record of the official receipt?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; surely.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, this forty or fifty thousand dollars in cash contributions that goes through your hands, with respect to that you give each contributor a temporary receipt?

Mr. WEINER. Just a temporary receipt.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you keep a copy of that receipt?

Mr. WEINER. No. I just make a temporary receipt.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not put it on a carbon somewhere to have a copy for yourself?

Mr. WEINER. No; because I immediately turn it over to the book-keeper and an official receipt is issued.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you give out a temporary receipt without keeping copies of the temporary receipts?

Mr. WEINER. I do not have to.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the use of giving them a temporary receipt in the first instance, then?

Mr. WEINER. So that the fellow knows at least he has something to show in case I take the money away and he comes up to the office, if within a week he does not get an official receipt, and he can lodge a complaint with the officers of the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a copy, however, of every official receipt?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. And you give that official receipt to every one who contributes to the organization?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that correct?

Mr. WEINER. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. The temporary receipt, then, is a way of checking upon you personally, your liability?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Your responsibility?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. To get back to the personal account in the Chase Bank, or the semipersonal account, is that account audited?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. By whom?

Mr. WEINER. The same person who audits the books.

Mr. THOMAS. What is his name?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Greenbaum.

Mr. THOMAS. Is he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, when was your account—that is, the Communist Party account under your name—opened in the Amalgamated Bank?

Mr. WEINER. I do not remember.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not remember?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. To the best of your recollection?

Mr. WEINER. Absolutely I do not remember.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not have any idea? Was it opened since you have become financial secretary?

Mr. WEINER. It must have been opened sometime in 1937, I believe.

Mr. WHITLEY. It must have been sometime in 1937, but you are not positive?

Mr. WEINER. I am not positive.

Mr. WHITLEY. This account in the Chase National Bank under your personal name—when was that opened?

Mr. WEINER. Either the end of 1936 or the beginning of 1937; I would not remember. I am very bad on dates. I can check that and give you the information.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the average of the annual deposits in that account in the Chase National Bank, where you mingle your own personal funds with those of the party?

Mr. WEINER. Oh, several thousand dollars a year.

Mr. WHITLEY. That could be anything from two to fifteen or twenty thousand dollars?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. What do you mean by several?

Mr. WEINER. It would be probably from two to eight.

Mr. WHITLEY. Two to eight thousand dollars?

Mr. WEINER. Or \$10,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. Average annual deposits?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what branch of the Chase National Bank is that?

Mr. WEINER. Fourteenth Street.

Mr. WHITLEY. Fourteenth Street?

Mr. WEINER. And Fifth Avenue.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is the Amalgamated Bank connected with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, headed by Sidney Hillman?

Mr. WEINER. I would not know that. I do not know the set-up.

Mr. WHITLEY. The two accounts you have mentioned, the one under your name in the Amalgamated, and the other under your name in the Chase, the Fourteenth Street branch, are the only two bank accounts maintained by the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, what is the nature of the regular or routine expenditures made by the party during the course of a year?

Mr. WEINER. I should say wages, telephone—

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you give us the approximate amounts of those expenditures, say, for 1938?

Mr. WEINER. I have some notes here. Wages, \$31,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are some of the other items?

Mr. WEINER. Rent, \$4,800.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is rent for the national headquarters?

Mr. WEINER. Yes. Telephone, \$3,000; telegraph, about \$2,500; postage, expressage, \$2,645; stationery and supplies, about \$2,400; traveling, about \$10,000; national committee meetings, \$5,000.

We had a special party-building congress in 1938, about \$3,000.

Mr. STARNES. What was that last item?

Mr. WEINER. Party-building congress, a special congress to take up the problem of building the party.

Mr. STARNES. Where was that held?

Mr. WEINER. In New York. Education department and literature, \$4,000.

Party news bulletin, \$500. I am giving you just the round figures. Publicity and press service, \$1,442.

Mr. WHITLEY. \$1,442 is the total amount expended for publicity during the year 1938?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any item on there entitled "Propaganda"?

Mr. WEINER. No. Auditing, \$500. Social-security taxes, \$502. Unemployment-insurance taxes, \$1,121.

We gave a contribution to the Tom Mooney defense fund, \$1,000. Subsidies to various districts, and so forth, about \$39,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is that about subsidies?

Mr. WEINER. To districts.

Mr. WHITLEY. How much?

Mr. WEINER. Districts and various special activities, as I mentioned before, about \$39,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. That would cover approximately the 10 subsidies you mentioned to State organizations?

Mr. WEINER. Ten subsidies to State organizations and special appropriations for special campaigns.

Mr. WHITLEY. The total subsidies and total special appropriations for the year 1938 was approximately \$39,000 in round figures?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those represent the routine expenditures?

Mr. WEINER. Just about; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. As reflected on your financial statement?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. All of those that you have read with the exception of that one item of subsidies are just routine expenditures-rent, printing, postage, telegraph, and so forth?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would all special expenditures of any kind or unusual expenditures be lumped under that one item of subsidies?

Mr. WEINER. Some of them would; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where else would they be on that statement if they were not under that item?

Mr. WEINER. It would not be any other place.

Mr. WHITLEY. That one item represents all subsidies or special contributions, or special expenditures of any kind?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. During the year 1938, lumped under the heading of "subsidies"?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. One question. When you were installed as financial secretary, did the preceding secretary hand you the books?

Mr. WEINER. Well, no. The books were in the custody of the bookkeeper.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you get any books showing the condition of the party when you were installed?

Mr. WEINER. No. I got the statement of the accountant.

The CHAIRMAN. You got the statement of accounts.

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did it not show what bank the accounts were in?

Mr. WEINER. No. I said the statement of the accountant.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not get any canceled checks?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not get any records that would show you where they were doing their banking business?

Mr. WEINER. No; I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. What records did you get when you were being installed as secretary?

Mr. WEINER. I did not get any records except the records that the bookkeeper had.

The CHAIRMAN. What were his records?

Mr. WEINER. The books and the receipts and the vouchers of the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. And they did not show what bank you were doing business with?

Mr. WEINER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will recess until 1:30.  
(Whereupon, a recess was taken until 1:30 p. m.)

#### AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed its session at 1:30 o'clock p. m., upon the expiration of the recess.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. You may proceed, Mr. Whitley.

#### TESTIMONY OF ROBERT WILLIAM WEINER—Resumed

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, you stated this morning during your testimony that the Communist headquarters at certain times and on certain occasions made contributions in the form of subsidies to local organizations to support progressive measures or to support the cause of progressives. Would you classify individuals or organizations who support the Soviet-German nonaggression pact as progressives?

Mr. WEINER. Would I what?

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you classify individuals who support the Soviet-Nazi nonaggression pact as progressives?

Mr. WEINER. I certainly would.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would. Now, on the question of—

Mr. VOORHIS. Just a minute. Do you think that pact was a severe blow at nazi-ism?

Mr. WEINER. I think that pact was a severe blow at the axis.

Mr. VOORHIS. It did not hurt Germany any, though?

Mr. WEINER. If it hurt the axis, it must have hurt Germany, too.

Mr. VOORHIS. Do you think that is why Germany negotiated it?

Mr. WEINER. Germany had no choice.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Weiner, what publications does the Communist Party of the United States own or support or sponsor?

Mr. WEINER. The Daily Worker—that is the official organ of the party; The Communist, a monthly publication; National Issues—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). How often does that come out?

Mr. WEINER. Once a month. And they are very much interested in the Midwest Daily Worker.

Mr. WHITLEY. You say you are interested?

Mr. WEINER. We support it.

Mr. WHITLEY. You mean financially and otherwise?

Mr. WEINER. Financially only in the form of loans. We have given them some loans.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not subsidies; just loans?

Mr. WEINER. No; just loans.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have they paid the loans back?

Mr. WEINER. They have paid some back, and they still owe us some money.

Mr. WHITLEY. What security do you take for those loans?

Mr. WEINER. No security.

Mr. MASON. Where is that published?

Mr. WEINER. In Chicago.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other publications is the party interested in?

Mr. WEINER. The New Masses.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the relationship between the party and the New Masses?

Mr. WEINER. It is an entirely independent publication. The editorial board consists of Communists and some non-Communists. But, being a progressive journal, we are interested in that.

Mr. WHITLEY. You just support that in the same manner that you do the Midwest Record?

Mr. WEINER. In about the same manner; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is not a subsidiary organization of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEINER. No; it is not.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is entirely independent?

Mr. WEINER. Independent.

Mr. WHITLEY. You say it has Communists and non-Communists on the board. Name some of the non-Communists.

Mr. WEINER. Well, I would not know who they are; but I know the underlying principle of the publication is to attract non-Communists.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is a progressive publication?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. It supports the Soviet pact and progressive issues of that kind?

Mr. WEINER. I don't know about that. It supports the general, broad aspect of the party policy.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the party lend their money occasionally to help them out?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is there any security for those funds?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many of those loans have been paid back?

Mr. WEINER. At one time they owed us as much as eleven or twelve thousand dollars.

Mr. WHITLEY. What do they owe you today?

Mr. WEINER. Today they owe us about, approximately six and one-half thousand.

Mr. WHITLEY. Over what period of time—

Mr. WEINER. Oh, 3 or 4 years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you been lending money to that organization?

Mr. WEINER. Three or four years.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other publications does the party sponsor or control, directly or indirectly? If New Masses did not follow the party line, you would withdraw that financial support, would you not, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. I did not get the question.

Mr. WHITLEY. I say, if New Masses and the Midwest Daily Record did not follow the party line, you would withdraw that financial support, would you not?

Mr. WEINER. Well, if they did not support the—

Mr. WHITLEY. Progressive?

Mr. WEINER. The general progressive aims of the democratic movement, we would withdraw the support.

Mr. STARNES. Wait a minute. Let us get this term "democratic" defined. You are not speaking about the Democratic Party?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. All right.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is speaking of the Communist movement.

Mr. VOORHIS. Suppose one of those organs should come out and criticize the Soviet-Nazi pact; what would happen?

Mr. WEINER. I could not say at this time.

Mr. VOORHIS. Do you have an idea?

Mr. WEINER. No; the party would have to decide on that.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other publications does the party sponsor?

Mr. WEINER. By the way, there are other policies besides the Soviet pact.

Mr. VOORHIS. I know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have named the Daily Worker, the daily paper; the Communist, a monthly magazine; and National Issues, a monthly publication, as the three—

Mr. WEINER. That are directly owned and operated by the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the only three; is that correct?

Mr. WEINER. The only three, I think. Yes; the only three.

Mr. WHITLEY. They are owned by separate corporations?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. But those corporations are under the control of the party?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you have named New Masses. That comes out every 2 weeks, does it?

Mr. WEINER. Every week.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is a weekly publication. And the Midwest Record?

Mr. WEINER. The Midwest Record.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is a daily paper?

Mr. WEINER. That is right; and People's World.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does that come in the same category?

Mr. WEINER. The same category as the Daily Record.

Mr. WHITLEY. How much have you loaned to the People's World in the last 5 years?

Mr. WEINER. They have not been in existence that long. They are only about 2 years old, I believe.

Mr. WHITLEY. All right; during that period?

Mr. WEINER. I think about six or seven thousand dollars.

Mr. WHITLEY. And on the same terms and conditions?

Mr. WEINER. The same terms and conditions.

Mr. WHITLEY. No security?

Mr. WEINER. No security.

Mr. WHITLEY. What rate of interest do you charge on those loans?

Mr. WEINER. No interest.

Mr. WHITLEY. And as long as that publication follows the party lines, I suppose the party will continue to support it financially.

Mr. WEINER. If it needs support, and we are able to, we will.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are there any other publications that come in that same category?

Mr. WEINER. I think not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those three, New Masses, People's World, and Midwest Record—

Mr. STARNES (interposing). How about the New South, edited by Paul Crouch, which Mr. Browder told us of?

Mr. WEINER. The New South is—I don't think it is controlled directly by the party. I am not sure of that.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are not sure what the relationship is?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether the party subsidizes it?

Mr. WEINER. I think, if there is any subsidy to the New South, it comes from the party organization in the district; but I would not be sure.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know whether any of that \$2,000 that you let Robert Hall have last year went for that purpose or not?

Mr. WEINER. I don't know.

Mr. STARNES. It could have been used for that?

Mr. WEINER. It could have been used for that; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have named two party publications, and three which, while they are not directly controlled by the party, are subsidized by the party?

Mr. WEINER. They are not subsidies. We expect to get the money back.

Mr. WHITLEY. But under those circumstances don't you think "subsidy" is the better word for it?

Mr. WEINER. No. It would be a subsidy if we never expected to get it back; but this money we expect to get back.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you have no evidence of the debt; you give them the money, and you hope that some day they will hand it back to you?

Mr. WEINER. We come to a certain understanding and lay down certain terms.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of course, if they deviate from the party line, you could sue them, could you not?

Mr. WEINER. We did not think that far.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the terms of the loan?

Mr. WEINER. As to the terms, these papers engage in public collections of money once a year, and the idea is that when they collect their money they have to pay back to the national office what they owe.

Mr. STARNES. They also carry out the party line in their news policy?

Mr. WEINER. The question of the party line is not contingent upon whether we give them money or not.

The CHAIRMAN. You just assume they will do that, anyway?

Mr. WEINER. It is just understood; but so far as the money is concerned, the Daily Record is engaged now in a campaign to raise \$50,000. We expect to get part of the money they owe us out of this \$50,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is the party organization in Chicago helping in that campaign?

Mr. WEINER. I presume so. I am not sure.

Mr. WHITLEY. What, approximately, is the indebtedness of the New Masses Publishing Co. to the party?

Mr. WEINER. I believe it is around six or six and one-half thousand dollars.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what is the extent of the indebtedness of the People's World to the party?

Mr. WEINER. If I am not mistaken, it also runs \$6,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the indebtedness of the Midwest Daily Record?

Mr. WEINER. It is much more. It is about seventeen or eighteen thousand.

Mr. WHITLEY. And those figures represent loans, as you describe them, which have been made to those publications over a period of several years?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, the Communist Party also subsidizes its own publications, does it not, Mr. Weiner? For instance, the Daily Worker. What is the extent of the annual subsidy to that publication?

Mr. WEINER. There is no subsidy. The Daily Worker operates on a deficit of about \$85,000 a year, and they raise yearly about that amount. They are engaged now in a campaign to raise \$100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, every year the Daily Worker lacks \$85,000 of being able to meet its expenses?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And at the end of the year that is raised by contributions?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Some of the contributions are in cash?

Mr. WEINER. Most of the contributions are in cash.

The CHAIRMAN. Is not that rather strange? What is the purpose of that? Has that been going on for years?

Mr. WEINER. What?

The CHAIRMAN. This thing of the Daily Worker running \$85,000 behind every year and then setting aside a time for raising the money.

Mr. WEINER. That is right. That is a yearly affair.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be a convenient way of getting a foreign subsidy, would it not?

Mr. WEINER. The books of the Daily Worker are open for public inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. But, for example, if Russia wanted to subsidize the Daily Worker, and they would send cash to the United States and give it to some of the party members to put in a cash contribution, and you

pass the hat around in these meetings, would that not be a convenient way of having a foreign subsidy?

Mr. WEINER. That would be too simple a way.

The CHAIRMAN. You would want a more complex way?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; a more complex way. It is too obvious and too simple.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not see what would be simple about it.

Mr. WEINER. The \$100,000 is being collected from thousands upon thousands of people. It is the mass support that helps the paper to exist, and the Daily Worker is at present engaged in a campaign to raise a hundred thousand dollars in order to secure itself for the coming year; and every day, when we receive money, receipts are issued and entries are made in the books, and it is an open and above-board proposition. It is a public campaign.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do the financial transactions of the Daily Worker come under your supervision or control in any manner?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. They do not?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. They are handled separately by the corporation?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. There is a separate accounting department?

Mr. WEINER. A separate accounting department, a separate bank account, and separate books.

Mr. WHITLEY. They have their own bookkeeping?

Mr. WEINER. Oh, sure.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, how about the monthly magazine, the Communist? To what extent does the Communist Party finance that publication or subsidize it?

Mr. WEINER. I am not sure whether it is self supporting or not. It is being handled by the Workers Library Publishers, but I know that the party is not giving any cash subsidies to the paper.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have they given any in recent years, to your knowledge?

Mr. WEINER. To my knowledge, no.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, as far as you know, as financial secretary of the party, the Communist is self-supporting?

Mr. WEINER. I think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. And it is put out by the Workers Library Publishers?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is put out by that corporation?

Mr. WEINER. Yes. They handle the business phases of it.

Mr. WHITLEY. They handle a great deal of other business for the party, do they?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, National Issues. To what extent is that subsidized?

Mr. WEINER. Oh, perhaps with about—it is a new publication, by the way.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; I know it is.

Mr. WEINER. Probably a thousand or fifteen hundred dollars.

Mr. WHITLEY. A year?

Mr. WEINER. A year.

Mr. WHITLEY. All right. Now, can you give me offhand—and if not, will you furnish later to the committee—the names of the officers and the incorporators and the directors of the six publications which we have been discussing here?

Mr. WEINER. I will furnish them. I could not give them to you offhand.

Mr. WHITLEY. All right; we will put them in the record later.

Mr. BRODSKY. Did you receive the information that I sent you?

Mr. WHITLEY. I received some of it, but this was a part of the information that I have not received.

Mr. BRODSKY. All right; just tell me what you want.

Mr. WHITLEY. The names of the incorporators, officers, and directors of the Daily Worker Publishing Co.—I believe that is the name of the company that publishes the Daily Worker; the Workers Library Publishers, which puts out the Communist; the organization, whatever it is, that puts out National Issues; and the same for New Masses, People's World, and the Midwest Record.

Mr. VOORHIS. In time of a political campaign, Mr. Weiner, you collect money, I presume, for the purpose of prosecuting the campaign, do you not?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. VOORHIS. Do you make reports of those contributions to the Clerk of the House of Representatives?

Mr. WEINER. Right.

Mr. VOORHIS. In the same manner—

Mr. WEINER. As any political party.

Mr. VOORHIS. You made those reports in 1936?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Mr. VOORHIS. And in 1938?

Mr. WEINER. I do not know about 1938. I don't think we had—in 1938 the national organization did not participate independently in the campaign.

Mr. VOORHIS. But in every national campaign you do make such reports?

Mr. WEINER. Right. In 1936 we had a special bank account, and upon the termination of the campaign a statement was filed with the proper authorities.

Mr. VOORHIS. How do you tell what contributions are intended for the campaign and what may be intended for some other purpose?

Mr. WEINER. We initiate a special campaign, with separate people in charge.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all for the time being?

Mr. WHITLEY. No; I have just a few more questions which I think can be answered very briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the literature department of the Communist Party of the United States, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. The literature department?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WEINER. Well, that is chiefly the Workers Library Publishers.

Mr. WHITLEY. Chiefly?

Mr. WEINER. I mean almost exclusively.

Mr. WHITLEY. When you say the literature department you mean the Workers Library Publishers?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that what might be called the literary committee of the party—the officers of that company?

Mr. WEINER. The officers, with perhaps the addition of one or two members of the national committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. And is that synonymous with the Workers Library Publishers?

Mr. WEINER. More or less.

Mr. WHITLEY. More or less? Is it or is it not?

Mr. WEINER. The officers of the Workers Library Publishers constitute that committee, and additional members of the Workers Library Publishers are on the committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, Mr. Weiner, what is the connection or relationship, if any, between the Communist Party of the United States and the Amtorg Trading Corporation?

Mr. WEINER. No connections whatever.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the connection, financial or otherwise, between the Communist Party of the United States and World Tourists?

Mr. WEINER. No connection at all.

Mr. WHITLEY. They have no transactions or relations with them?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. What about Intourist?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any transactions, financial or otherwise, or any relationship with the Communist Party?

Mr. WEINER. No relation whatever.

Mr. WHITLEY. What about the International Publishers? What are the relations between the party and International Publishers?

Mr. WEINER. As producer to consumer.

Mr. WHITLEY. In that instance International Publishers are the producers?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Communist Party is the consumer?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is purely a business relationship?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. There is no actual connection or affiliation there; it is just a business relationship?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just as you would do business with any other publishing company?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have also mentioned the Workers Library Publishers, Inc. Is that relationship just as a consumer?

Mr. WEINER. No; it is more than that.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is it? Explain it briefly for us.

Mr. WEINER. Well, it is tied up more closely with the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what way? Does the party own it, operate it, own stock in it? What do you mean by tied up? It is a party subsidiary, is it not?

Mr. WEINER. I would call it that; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the simplest way to describe it, as a party subsidiary?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. It handles its publication and distribution?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about the Wholesale Book Corporation? What is the relationship, financial or otherwise?

Mr. WEINER. I would not know. That is a State affair.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is it affiliated with the Communist Party in any manner?

Mr. WEINER. Not with the national office.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not with the national office?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is it with the State organization?

Mr. WEINER. I would not know the exact relationship between the wholesale and the State committee of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would not?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Communist Party subsidize the Wholesale Book Corporation in any manner?

Mr. WEINER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would know if it did, would you not?

Mr. WEINER. Oh, the national offices does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. If it is subsidized, it is through the State organization?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. All right. How about the Morning Freedom Publishing Co.? What is the relationship of that organization with the Communist Party, financial or otherwise?

Mr. WEINER. Well, it is a paper in Yiddish.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where is it published; in New York?

Mr. WEINER. In New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is it owned or operated by the party?

Mr. WEINER. No; it is owned and operated by a special corporation.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that corporation controlled by the party?

Mr. WEINER. I think all of the members of the corporation are party members. I am not sure.

Mr. WHITLEY. All the members of the corporation?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Well, that is the same proposition that exists with the Daily Worker, is it not?

Mr. WEINER. Except that the Daily Worker is the official organ of the Communist Party, and the Morning Freedom is not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is the Morning Freedom Publishing Co.—what is the name of the paper or publication that they put out?

Mr. WEINER. The name of the paper is the Freiheit.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Freiheit; and that is the Jewish Communist paper, is it not?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And it has substantially the same relationship as the Daily Worker with the party, except that it is not designated the official organ of the party?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Otherwise it is just the same; Communist members are organizers of and run both of them; is that correct?

Mr. WEINER (to Mr. Brodsky). You know the set-up of the corporation, don't you?

Mr. BRODSKY. No; I do not.

Mr. WEINER. I am not sure of that, but it is a Communist paper.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you, Mr. Brodsky, furnish us with the names of the officers and directors?

Mr. BRODSKY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. To what extent does the Communist Party finance the Morning Freedom Publishing Co.?

Mr. WEINER. We do not finance the Morning Freedom Publishing Co.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not finance it at all?

Mr. WEINER. We do not finance it at all.

Mr. WHITLEY. There are no financial transactions between the Morning Freedom Publishing Co. and the Communist Party?

Mr. WEINER. I would not say none at all. Sometimes we help them raise money for the paper.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you do not lend them money?

Mr. WEINER. We sometimes lend it to them, too.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do lend them money, as you have previously described with reference to other publications?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the Weekly Masses Co., Inc.; what corporation is that?

Mr. WEINER. What do you mean by that?

Mr. WHITLEY. The Weekly Masses Co., Inc.

Mr. WEINER. I presume that is the corporation that publishes the New Masses.

Mr. WHITLEY. I thought you said that the Workers Library Publishers published that.

Mr. WEINER. Oh, no; not the New Masses. The Workers Library Publishers publishes the Communist and the National Issues.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Weekly Masses Co., Inc., publishes the New Masses; that is a separate corporation?

Mr. WEINER. That is a separate corporation.

Mr. WHITLEY. To what extent does the party finance that? I believe you have already covered that.

Mr. WEINER. I have described that.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the F. and D. Printing Corporation?

Mr. WEINER. The F. and D. Printing Corporation; that is the printing shop that prints the Daily Worker, the Freiheit, and one or two other publications.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the corporation that actually does the printing?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; it operates the shop.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is a separate corporation from the publishing corporation?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And it does the printing of the Freiheit and the Daily Worker?

Mr. WEINER. And some other publications.

Mr. WHITLEY. Some other publications of the party?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. To what extent does the party subsidize or make loans to the F. and D. Printing Corporation?

Mr. WEINER. To no extent.

Mr. WHITLEY. None at all?

Mr. WEINER. None at all.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is self-supporting?

Mr. WEINER. I presume so.

Mr. WHITLEY. So far as you know?

Mr. WEINER. So far as I know; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are all the officers and members of the board of directors Communists?

Mr. WEINER. I do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you add that to your list, Mr. Brodsky?

Mr. BRODSKY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, the New Age Publishers. What is the relationship of that company to the party, financial or otherwise?

Mr. WEINER. The New Age?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is right.

Mr. WEINER. None whatever.

Mr. WHITLEY. No relation, financial or otherwise?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the Labor Research Association, and what is its relationship to the party?

Mr. WEINER. Well, the Labor Research Association—the name is self-explanatory, and we have no financial relation with them except that we sometimes purchase material from them—monthly reports on the economic situation, labor trends, and so forth.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is entirely independent and nonpartisan?

Mr. WEINER. Entirely independent and nonpartisan.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is a research board?

Mr. WEINER. A research bureau.

Mr. WHITLEY. The party does not lend it any money?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about the officers of that board?

Mr. WEINER. I do not know who the officers are.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know anything about their affiliations?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. They are entirely independent, so far as you know?

Mr. WEINER. Entirely independent.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you have no relation except that you occasionally purchase some statistics and figures from them?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. And how about the American League for Peace and Democracy? What are its relations with the Communist Party, either financially or otherwise?

Mr. WEINER. Well, otherwise I don't know. I think that has been described many times by Mr. Browder.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about the financial relationship?

Mr. WEINER. At one time, when the party was officially affiliated with the organization, we would pay an affiliation fee.

Mr. WHITLEY. And dues, probably?

Mr. WEINER. And probably dues.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that affiliation, I believe Mr. Browder stated, was formally, at least, terminated in 1937.

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Since that time what has been the relationship?

Mr. WEINER. Since that time the relationship has been that from time to time we would support the activities of the league.

Mr. WHITLEY. Financially?

Mr. WEINER. Sometimes financially.

Mr. WHITLEY. By contributions?

Mr. WEINER. By contributions; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just to support their activities?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much contribution do you give to the league?

Mr. WEINER. Over the period since 1937?

The CHAIRMAN. Since you broke with them.

Mr. WEINER. Since we broke with them? I don't know exactly, but probably from two to three thousand dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. From two to three thousand dollars you have contributed since you ended the formal connection. Before then how much contribution did you give, in addition to dues?

Mr. WEINER. No; we just paid the per capita or affiliation fee, which probably amounted to about a couple of thousand dollars a year.

The CHAIRMAN. And beginning in 1937 you separated, as far as the public was concerned, from your affiliation with the league, but continued pay just as much money as you previously had paid in dues?

Mr. WEINER. Probably just as much. We have not lost our sympathy with the activities of the league.

The CHAIRMAN. But you said that your dues amounted to two or three thousand dollars before that.

Mr. WEINER. Annually.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you not given the equivalent since 1937 of what you would have given if you had been formally identified with it?

Mr. WEINER. Not necessarily the equivalent, but something close to that.

The CHAIRMAN. And that was only a matter of policy that you did that?

Mr. WEINER. That is right; because the Communist Party was the only political party affiliated with the league.

Mr. THOMAS. In other words, you broke with them just as a devoted husband would break with a devoted wife by giving her a new fur coat? [Laughter.]

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the connection between the Communist Party and the International Workers' Order—the I. W. O.—financially or otherwise, to your knowledge, Mr. Weiner?

Mr. WEINER. No connections.

Mr. WHITLEY. No connections at all: no dealings or transactions?

Mr. WEINER. No dealings or transactions.

Mr. WHITLEY. All right. You are the president of the I. W. O., are you not?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. But that is entirely separate and apart from your duties as financial secretary of the party?

Mr. WEINER. I was active in that organization long before I became financial secretary of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. The I. W. O. is the same as the Morning Freedom Publishing Co., is it not?

Mr. WEINER. They are two separate and distinct corporations.

Mr. WHITLEY. No; I mean the Morning Freiheit and the Morning Freedom Publishing Co.

Mr. WEINER. Oh, that is right. They are one and the same.

Mr. WHITLEY. What, Mr. Weiner, approximately, is the total amount received by the national headquarters from the Illinois State organization over the period of a year; say 1938, for example?

Mr. WEINER. I would not be able to say as to that without referring to the record, because most of the dues and income are handled by the bookkeeper and I would have to refer to the books.

Mr. WHITLEY. You could not give me an estimate?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You did make an estimate as to the Illinois organization?

Mr. WEINER. But that I saw.

Mr. WHITLEY. The budget is based on the income, and can you not from that figure give the approximate percentage?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You said the budget was approximately \$65,000 to \$75,000?

Mr. WEINER. No; I said the budget was about forty to fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. Do you know whether you got as much as \$10,000 or \$20,000 from the Illinois organization? Just approximately; I realize you do not have the figures before you.

Mr. WEINER. Possibly as much as \$8,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. Possibly \$8,000?

Mr. WEINER. Eight to ten thousand dollars.

Mr. WHITLEY. That would be approximately the percentage.

Mr. WEINER. Yes; that was a large organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you not about covered that?

Mr. WHITLEY. Just a few more items, Mr. Chairman. How about the Pennsylvania organization?

Mr. WEINER. The Pennsylvania organization would not be so much; we did not receive very much from the Pennsylvania organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. You did not receive as much as you did from the Illinois organization?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which was about \$8,000.

How about the New York State organization, which is your largest?

Mr. WEINER. The dues, I think we received in 1938, from the New York organization, around, from dues alone, around \$30,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. Around \$30,000?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what other sum did you receive during 1938?

Mr. WEINER. Well, from mass assemblies, mass meetings—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). You stated that would be approximately the same as from dues?

Mr. WEINER. Probably we got from the New York organization about \$50,000 altogether.

Mr. WHITLEY. Around \$50,000 from dues and mass collections?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is approximately correct?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you identify for me and indicate the relationship of Samuel Miller with the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. WEINER. Samuel Miller?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. Do you know him?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know his relationship with the party?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. How about Max Kitzes?

Mr. WEINER. He is bookkeeper at the national headquarters.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is bookkeeper also of the Daily Worker?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does he have any connection with the Daily Worker?

Mr. WEINER. Not that I know of.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just in the national office?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where you are located?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know Larry Taylor; and what are his connections with the Communist Party?

Mr. WEINER. Larry Taylor?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WEINER. There is a young chap, Larry, works in the national office, sort of an errand boy and helps out on the mimeograph.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether his name is Taylor?

Mr. WEINER. I always called him Larry.

Mr. WHITLEY. And he got a salary of how much?

Mr. WEINER. He gets about, I think, \$22.50 or \$25 a week.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Carl Winters, and what is his relationship with the party?

Mr. WEINER. Carl Winters is a party organizer.

Mr. WHITLEY. A party organizer?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where is he located?

Mr. WEINER. At present in Minnesota.

Mr. WHITLEY. Minnesota?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is L. J. Jacobi?

Mr. WEINER. I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know?

Mr. WEINER. If he has any connection with the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Sam Carr; who is he and what is his connection with the party?

Mr. WEINER. Sam Carr? I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know about him? Do you know whether he has had any connection with the financial affairs of the party?

Mr. WEINER. Sam Carr—I think Sam Carr is a Canadian.

Mr. WHITLEY. A Canadian?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. A party member?

Mr. WEINER. Whether he is the same, I don't know; I don't know whether his name is "Sam."

Mr. WHITLEY. Anyway you are not able to identify him for us?

Mr. WEINER. I think he is in the Canadian party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he an official or just a member?

Mr. WEINER. I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know whether he has any functional connection?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you had any dealings with him?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; I met him several times.

Mr. WHITLEY. I mean official dealings?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Financial transactions of any kind?

Mr. WEINER. I do not think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not remember?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. If you had had any would you remember?

Mr. WEINER. I suppose if I had, but I don't know.

Mr. STARNES. Is he a banker?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Does he have any relationship to the bank or in the banking business?

Mr. WEINER. I have no idea.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are not sure whether you had any transactions with him?

Mr. WEINER. He did not impress me as a banker, not this Carr.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know whether you have had financial transactions with him; you do not remember that.

Mr. Weiner, you stated, I believe, that during 1938 you got approximately \$50,000 income from the New York organization, that is, altogether, in dues and everything, of which about \$30,000 was dues?

Mr. WEINER. I think \$30,000 of it was.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the balance was made up of organizational activities?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Tell me, Mr. Weiner, would it be possible for the New York organization to have received and have on hand a large sum of money that you would not know about as a national officer?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; it would be possible.

Mr. WHITLEY. It would be possible?

Mr. WEINER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, that they would not have accounted to you for?

Mr. WEINER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever had the experience of State organizations, where they have concealed large sums of money from the national organization?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. That has never happened to your knowledge?

Mr. WEINER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. It could?

Mr. WEINER. It could.

Mr. WHITLEY. But it would be unusual?

Mr. WEINER. It would be unusual; we have no airtight control over them.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have no what?

Mr. WEINER. Airtight control.

Mr. WHITLEY. They have to submit reports?

Mr. WEINER. They have to submit reports, yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe that is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Bring Mr. William Browder.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM E. BROWDER, STATE TREASURER OF THE NEW YORK STATE COMMUNIST PARTY, ACCCOMPANIED BY ED KUNTZ, ATTORNEY, NEW YORK CITY, REPRESENTING WILLIAM BROWDER

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give us your full name?

Mr. KUNTZ. My name is Ed Kuntz. I am an attorney. My address is 100 Fifth Avenue, New York. I represent Mr. Browder, the witness here.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your full name, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. William E. Browder.

Mr. WHITLEY. William E.?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever been known by any other name?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have not?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your present address, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. 49 Grove Street, New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. Bronx?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Manhattan.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your business address?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. 250 West One Hundred and Sixth Street.

Mr. WHITLEY. 250 West One Hundred and Sixth Street?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where were you born?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Wichita, Kans.

Mr. WHITLEY. When were you born?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. July 31, 1895.

Mr. WHITLEY. Were you in the World War?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I was not.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were not?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you married or single?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Married.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever been arrested in the United States or elsewhere?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. When and where: describe the circumstance?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, about May 30, 1917, arrested before the application of the draft law. The draft law became operative and I refused to register and was indicted, and then a couple of times since then for speaking on the streets: once in Chicago during the fight for the traction franchise: I don't remember the year that was.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are a brother of Earl Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Were you convicted on any of these charges or as a result of these arrests?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Convicted on two charges.

Mr. WHITLEY. Two charges; and what were they?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. First, refusing to register, and, second, conspiracy.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the conspiracy?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Conspiracy to defeat the operation of the draft: that would be as a result of the refusal to register.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. And you were arrested thereafter for speaking on the street in connection with a demonstration. Were you convicted in connection with those arrests?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were not?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where have you lived in the United States, Mr. Browder, and what occupations have you followed?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. In Wichita, where I was a bank clerk from 1913 to 1914, leaving there in 1914 for Kansas City. From 1914 to January 1929 I was a statistical clerk, bookkeeper, manager, and auditor of different institutions.

Chicago, from 1929 to January 1933, where I was for a while auditor of a big corporation, and in January I became the secretary of the Workers' International Relief for about 8 months, and, following that, about 6 months later, the organizer of the International Labor Defense for a year and 9 months.

Mr. WHITLEY. In Chicago?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. In Chicago.

And in New York City, January 1933 to the present.

The organizer and business manager of the New Masses up to 1936.

Mr. WHITLEY. Up until 1936?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. 1936.

Mr. WHITLEY. And since that time?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I was State treasurer, State finance secretary of the party in New York State from about March 1937 to, let me see, about May 1 of this year.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were State treasurer of the New York State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what is your present occupation?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I am the chairman of the eleventh assembly district in Manhattan.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is for the party?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. For the Communist Party?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long have you been a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Since February 1923.

Mr. WHITLEY. Since February 1933?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Twenty-three.

Mr. WHITLEY. Twenty-three, shortly after it was organized.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what positions have you held; just enumerate the positions you have held in the Communist Party since you have been a member?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, there was for a very brief period of about 3 or 4 months when I was treasurer of the party in Chicago.

Mr. WHITLEY. Treasurer of the party in Chicago?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That was for a very brief period.

Mr. WHITLEY. When I say name the positions that you have held with the party, I mean with the party or any of the affiliated organizations or subsidiaries.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Those are all the party positions I have held.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any connection with the Compro Daily Publishing Co.?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. For a while I was named the president because of the financial relationship between the State office.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know what period you were president?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Roughly, I would say that was from early 1938 to early 1939; I don't know the exact date; it would be somewhere between then.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was that until June 2 of this year?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It may be.

Mr. WHITLEY. That you were president of the Compro Daily?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you have no position with the party or any of the affiliated organizations at the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. Just a second. We did not excuse the other witness. I stated this morning, I thought I made it clear, that certain witnesses would be heard, would be given an opportunity to testify, and that he would be called back.

Mr. BRODSKY. I am sorry, but you did not make that clear, and when you said that is all he left.

The CHAIRMAN. Try to locate him.

All right; proceed, Mr. Whitley.

Mr. WHITLEY. The only official connection you have with the Communist Party or any of its affiliated organizations at the present time is chairman of the eleventh district in New York?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, Mr. Browder, what other organizations; that is, other than the Communist Party of the United States; how many affiliations do you belong to at the present time and have you belonged to in the past?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, I am now a member of, for insurance purposes, the International Workers' Order.

Mr. WHITLEY. You just hold a policy?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Hold a policy.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever held a position with that order?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Never.

Mr. WHITLEY. Never?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I had been a member a good many years ago of the office workers union in Kansas City, and a member of the International Labor Defense.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are still a member of that?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I am not and have not been since I have been in New York; I do not think I ever renewed my membership.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were a member of an organization in Chicago?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any other organizations, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, going clear back to 1914, connected with the Trade Educational League. That is about all I can think of.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your present salary as chairman of the eleventh assembly district in the State of New York?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. \$25 a week.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any other source of income?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where are you maintaining your personal bank account, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I have none now.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have none now.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, who succeeded you as State treasurer; that is, as treasurer of the New York State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Mr. David Leeds, the man whose place I took.

Mr. WHITLEY. As treasurer of the New York State organization, what were the sources of income for that organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Dues and the usual organizational activities and affairs, and then we conducted rather extensive campaigns for money raising in the branches.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, just the usual routine sources of income.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; we had some few individuals, minor contributions; they were not many.

Mr. WHITLEY. About how many would you say, Mr. Browder, approximately?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, that would be guesswork; I would say that it would not exceed—you mean the percentage?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. To guess, I would say it would run probably as high as 25 percent of the total income.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the total income during the period you were treasurer of the New York State organization; that is, from March 1937 to May 1939?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I don't think I could remember the 1937 figure.

The 1938 figure was roughly \$160,000. You were asking of the money that was available for the State to spend?

Mr. WHITLEY. That was available for the State organization.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. To spend in connection with its activities?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And approximately during that period, you could take the year 1938 as indicative, I imagine, as fairly close to the same figures for 1937 and 1939?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Roughly, I think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. Roughly?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Not far from it.

Mr. WHITLEY. It would not be far off.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No big discrepancy.

Mr. WHITLEY. During the year 1938 what was the total amount paid by the New York State organization to the headquarters—approximately?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, I could remember the dues with some fair degree of accuracy.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That was about \$30,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. About \$30,000?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the rest was from organizational activities?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. From organizational activities—that would be guessing; to guess, I would say slightly in excess of \$30,000?

Mr. WHITLEY. In excess?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Making approximately \$60,000 total?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; I would say roughly, approximately; it might be somewhat more.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; that represents all of the payments made by the State organization to the national party?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. And did the State organization make any contributions to the affiliated or subsidiary organizations, such as the Daily Worker?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You made a contribution to the Daily Worker?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; 1938, I think the amount was \$85,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. The national organization contributed that amount to the Daily Worker?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; the New York State organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. The New York State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Made that as a contribution?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the form of a subsidy or just as a gift?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; this was the result of a financial campaign in the fall of 1938 in which we raised a definite sum for that purpose through the branches.

Mr. WHITLEY. That constituted a fund for that purpose?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Raised during the campaign for the Daily Worker?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS. Was that a part of the \$160,000?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. VOORHIS. That was outside the \$160,000?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other contributions of any kind did you make to any of the affiliates or subsidiary organizations of the party, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Will you give me an indication of what you mean?

Mr. WHITLEY. Any publishing organization, Wholesale Book Publishers?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; well, there was for a brief period of about 4 months when we loaned the Wholesale Book Corporation two or three thousand dollars; that was repaid.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was just a loan?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; a temporary loan and was repaid.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, were there any other funds that you took in, aside from what you paid to the national organization and contributed to other activities, aside from the campaign for the \$85,000 for the Daily Worker? What other expenditures were made?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, there was one, now that I think of it, connected with the wholesale books that should be brought out. The wholesale book concern handled the sale of literature, organized for the sale of literature, and therefore from week to week, as collections for literature from branches came in that would be paid to them.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That, I would say would run roughly in the neighborhood of \$6,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you think of any others, name any other expenditures of any kind from the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. You are speaking of those that passed through my hands?

Mr. WHITLEY. I am speaking of money; yes, that passed through your hands as treasurer of the State organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, he did not have money from any other source.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the only source of your income?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. The usual source for the State organization?

Mr. BROWDER. That is right. Other than money raised for Spanish relief through our own branches which would clear through my account.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what would be the amount of those funds?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I find that difficult to estimate.

Mr. MASON. You have given only two items of approximately \$30,000 and the testimony shows that there was \$160,000 a year collected. You have given only \$30,000 from dues and \$30,000 from mass organizations, which makes only \$60,000 a year, a difference of \$100,000 in income.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. May I beg to differ with you on that?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Those two amounts you speak of are the amounts paid to the national office.

Mr. MASON. I see.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is what I referred to as the amounts paid to the national office.

Mr. WHITLEY. Aside from the items you have mentioned, Mr. Browder, what other funds were handled, what other expenditures were made, aside from the money expended and contributions which you have named?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I do not think of any others offhand.

Mr. STARNES. The I. L. D.?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. If we made any payments to the I. L. D. they would have been small.

The CHAIRMAN. How much money did you give the League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well I do not believe it would be in excess of \$200.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other contribution?

Mr. STARNES. What is the biggest contribution you have ever made, the largest contribution to any organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The largest I think was about \$100.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The State organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what was the annual budget, approximately, Mr. Browder, of the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. In the neighborhood of \$150,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the neighborhood of \$150,000?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And would your receipts for the State organization greatly exceed that?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. They did?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes: because the budget is only the amount which is assigned for expenditure of the State committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; would the \$60,000 that you gave to national headquarters be included in that?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; that would be in addition to the \$150,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. That would be an addition to the \$150,000?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, that is not considered a part of the State budget.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You said you would receive a few contributions but small amounts?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, what bank did you keep the account in as State treasurer?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It was banked in my account in the Manufacturers' Trust.

Mr. WHITLEY. Manufacturers' Trust?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what branch of the Manufacturers' Trust?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Ninth Street and University Place.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would there be any other accounts?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I had a comparatively small account in the Amalgamated Bank.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what name?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER (continuing). That was a small reserve.

Mr. WHITLEY. When was the account opened in the Manufacturers' Trust?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. When I first went there, which was about March 1937.

Mr. WHITLEY. March 1937?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And was that in the name of the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It was in my own name?

Mr. WHITLEY. In your own name?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. With authorization from the State committee to indorse checks in the name of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you signed all checks?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you personally handle all the receipts and all the disbursements of the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; I did not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you have to pass on them, to approve them?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I approved all disbursements.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you checked or handled all the receipts, of course, that were received by the sections and the branches which were sent to you monthly?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Weekly.

Mr. WHITLEY. Weekly?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you would receive all of them?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. From those sources?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I received them as treasurer.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words you were responsible for them?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you dictated the policy so far as the finances of the State organization was concerned?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, I did not dictate the policy; I helped to set the policy.

Mr. WHITLEY. At least it was subject to your approval?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You opened the account in your personal name?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes. In the Amalgamated Bank there was only a small account.

The CHAIRMAN. That was only a small account?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you banked the funds in your personal account, like any other personal account?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And all the checks, canceled checks, would go to you?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you keep the canceled checks?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. We have had them.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got those canceled checks?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Since 1937, I mean.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. But as to whether they are there I cannot say.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I do not know whether they have been kept; I have not been in charge of the office now for 4 months.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you find out for us?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And let us know whether they have been kept?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Whitley.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have named the sources of the income which you received as the State treasurer and you have indicated at least a portion of the disbursement.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And if there are any other disbursements you cannot recall them at the moment?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; none of any consequence, I would say.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. No other large or unusual disbursements. Now when did you open the account in the Amalgamated?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. In March 1937.

Mr. WHITLEY. March, the same time as the other?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was opened in your name?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Opened in my name.

Mr. WHITLEY. As far as the account was concerned it was a personal account?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What percentage or proportion of the income to the State organization did you put in the Amalgamated Bank?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. We cleared everything while that was the only account, we cleared everything through it; anything that came to me during my term of office cleared through the bank.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, at first, while you were treasurer you deposited in the Amalgamated Bank?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And all financial transactions were handled through the bank?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You said that the account in the Amalgamated was kept small. Was there any system; did you have any system as to what funds were kept in the Amalgamated and what were in the other account?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, as a matter of fact, I changed the account shortly after I became treasurer and used it only as a reserve account.

Mr. WHITLEY. Used the Amalgamated as a reserve account?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Most of the transactions were handled through the Manufacturers?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Cleared through the Manufacturers Trust.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Within a very short time after I took over.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, if the branches or the sections purchased literature how was that literature handled through the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That would be turned over by the branch finance secretary, to him, and by him cleared, in all instances, into my hands.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the literature would be handled in that manner?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. There may be a few exceptions of one or two sections.

Mr. WHITLEY. But ordinarily the section or branch would order literature and then they would make payment through you?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. They would pay you and you, in turn, would pay the people that supplied the literature?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what is the approximate amount of expenditures of that type, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. As I say, somewhat around \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that went to—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The Wholesale Book Corporation.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Wholesale Book Corporation?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; but also known as the literature department. They carry a bank account as the literature department.

Mr. WHITLEY. They are one and the same?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. We are still talking about 1938?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the Wholesale Book Corporation—is that a subsidiary or affiliate of the national organization or of the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, to the best of my knowledge, it is the State organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the State organization owns and operates that corporation?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was it under your supervision in any way?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It was not under my supervision in any way.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was your relation to it?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The State organization, you know, own it in the direct sense, but it was understood definitely as being our literature department.

Mr. WHITLEY. Your literature department?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the Wholesale Book Corporation was, in effect, the literature department of the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. It was not incorporated, was it?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I am not sure on that; I think it is. I think it is.

Mr. WHITLEY. You think it is incorporated?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. But the corporation, the State officers and the persons who determine its policies are under the control of the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of course, the State organization is, in turn, under the control of the national organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. So, indirectly, at least, the national organization exercises control over the Wholesale Book Corporation?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the Wholesale Book Corporation only function for the State?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. For the State.

Mr. WHITLEY. For the New York State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. For the New York State organization; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. It does not function for other State organizations?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; it does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. It just handles your orders?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; as a matter of fact—

Mr. WHITLEY. If any profits accrue—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. If any what?

Mr. WHITLEY. If any profits accrue from the operations of the Wholesale Book Corporation, do they go into the State treasury?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; if any had, they would.

Mr. WHITLEY. But they did not; there were no profits?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Not as far as I remember.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, does the State organization finance or put out any publications of its own?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It has one—the State of Affairs.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that a weekly or a monthly?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is usually monthly, but I think it puts out about an average of 10 issues a year; because, during the summer months, when the State legislature is not in session, it is not published.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that is financed entirely by the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. And by its subscribers.

Mr. WHITLEY. By the subscribers?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that handled by any separate organization or company of the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is handled by the State organization direct?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. As one of its activities?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you, as treasurer of the State organization, maintain any special accounts?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I did not.

Mr. WHITLEY. No special accounts of any kind?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the two accounts you have referred to, namely, the Amalgamated and the Manufacturers, would reflect all of the in-

come of the State organization during the period you were treasurer, and also all of the withdrawals from those accounts?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I am quite sure on that.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the budget, the annual budget of the organization, being \$160,000, I believe you said—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Between \$150,000 and \$160,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. And then about \$60,000 to the national organization would be \$220,000—this is for the year 1938—and then you cleared through that account \$85,000 for the Daily Worker?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you loaned \$2,000 to the New Masses, did you say?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; to the Wholesale—to the literature department.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was to the literature department?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was repaid?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; you can scratch that.

Mr. WHITLEY. We can check that off?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, \$6,000—

Mr. KUNTZ. That is \$6,000 a month for literature.

Mr. WHITLEY. Oh, that is for literature?

Mr. KUNTZ. That is for a month.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. \$6,000 a month?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That would be \$72,000 a year.

Mr. WHITLEY. For literature?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, payments you made to the literature department?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Through your account?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Then the \$50,000 item you mentioned, what was that?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Spain—money raised for Spanish relief. It came from our branches and cleared through our accounts.

Mr. WHITLEY. I am just trying to get an idea of the total.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. You would not get an idea even then, fully.

Mr. WHITLEY. For the year 1938, your budget was \$160,000, plus what you paid to the national organization, made \$220,000, and then these three items which you have mentioned as the principal additional expenses or payments, withdrawals, total \$122,000. That makes a total of \$342,000 for that year.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Now, in addition to that, you would have another item—

Mr. WHITLEY. I am including the Daily Worker there, \$85,000.

Mr. KUNTZ. It is more than that; 85, 50, and 72 would be more than

122.

Mr. WHITLEY. I did not put the \$85,000 in there.

Mr. STARNES. I get \$427,000.

Mr. KUNTZ. That would be closer to it.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. There is also a peculiarity of our accounting that requires that in the funds drive, during the funds drive, all funds raised must be cleared in gross through my account, for purposes of control. It would mean, if we raised \$242,000, my account would represent \$242,000 and the balance, the percentages going to the lower organizations, would be paid by check by me back to them.

Mr. WHITLEY. What do you mean by "funds drive"?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. This drive for funds that included the \$85,000 raised for the Daily Worker.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is funds for the Daily Worker, and for other purposes?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. For other organizational purposes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the total of that amount?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The total of the amount raised?

Mr. WHITLEY. Of the funds drive that went through your account.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. A total of \$242,000, including \$85,000—

Mr. THOMAS. Of course you have the \$85,000 in there already?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes. The \$85,000 is in there already.

Mr. WHITLEY. I will take that off.

Mr. STARNES. Now, does that \$242,000 include the \$50,000 for Spanish relief?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Oh, no.

Mr. STARNES. Just the \$85,000?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; that is right.

Mr. STARNES. Then you had that net sum?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, that is \$157,000 more on there. That would make the total approximately, then, through the two accounts, the Amalgamated and the other, for the year 1938, \$584,000?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That much; it could easily be that much.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is that much according to the figures you have given me.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is about right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, at the same time, as I understand it, you conducted a drive for the Daily Worker you also conducted a drive for other organizational activities?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you gave \$85,000 of that to the Daily Worker for 1938?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the balance—\$157,000—was kept by the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, there was \$10,000 of that given to the national office.

Mr. WHITLEY. \$10,000 was given to the national office?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That means \$147,000, then, was kept—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. By the State, county, sections, and branches.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see; it was distributed out?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. So that makes a total of \$584,000? I am just trying to get the total amount that cleared through your account for any and all purposes. Do you think of any other items, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; I cannot.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or any other sources of income that have not been mentioned?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or any other large expenditures that would materially alter these figures?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have already explained the literature department and your dealings with that organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What were the relations between the State organization and its treasury with the Morning Freedom Publishing Co.?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Very little, except for an occasional loan, maybe, for a very brief time, which was repaid?

Mr. WHITLEY. You did loan them money occasionally?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would you say; did they owe the State organization anything at the time you resigned as State treasurer?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I think probably they owed two or three thousand dollars; I am not sure of the amount.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the most the Morning Freedom Publishing Co. owed the State organization at any one time, to your knowledge?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Oh, as much as \$15,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. As much as \$15,000?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was made in the nature of a loan?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any security?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The best possible security.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that was what?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The character of the people we were dealing with.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see—any interest charged?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the Compro Daily Publishing Co. Your only financial relations there were in connection with the drive which you conducted?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; we made occasional loans to them.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have made loans to them?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In addition to the loans made to these organizations by the national headquarters?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. The State organization also made loans?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. On the same basis—no evidence of obligation and no interest?

Mr. KUNTZ. That is not correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Were not they reduced to notes?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Sometimes, and I would say any large amount; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You never did have a loan where it was just verbal?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Sometimes, if it were comparatively a small amount, it might be verbal; but in all events it would show on the ledger account.

The CHAIRMAN. It would show on the ledger account of the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. And also of the daily; both.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what were your transactions, financial or otherwise, with the Workers' Library Publishers, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Practically none during that period of time.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not recall any transactions?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I do not recall any transactions. There might—

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether Mr. Weiner is treasurer of the Workers' Library Publishers?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I don't know anything about its set-up.

Mr. WHITLEY. What were your transactions with the Wholesale Book Corporation?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. In the nature of payments for literature they had furnished to our branches.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the same as the literature department?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Weekly Masses Publishing Corporation: What were your relations there?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. None, except a friendly relationship; we helped their circulation whenever we could, and I think, on a couple of occasions, we loaned them two or three hundred dollars.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, if they could not get money from the national headquarters when they needed help, you would let them have it?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And they always paid it back?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. They always have.

Mr. WHITLEY. What were the relations of the State organization with the Gensup Stationery Co., Inc.?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Only that we bought our stationery largely from them.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is a party stationery supply concern, is it not?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Only in the sense it is run by a man who is friendly.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see; the party has no financial interest in it?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Hochberg is the head of that?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that "Gensup," is an abbreviation for "General Supply" Stationery Co., is it not?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITLEY. And if the party has any financial interest in it, you don't know it?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What transactions did the State organization have with the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. We raised some money for them; how much I don't remember.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the nature of contributions?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, this would come in the same way: that is, the most of it came through branches, raised by the branches for the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade specifically.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that included, say, for 1938—included in that \$242,000?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; that would be included in the amount for Spanish relief that I have mentioned.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was \$50,000, I believe?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was raised there?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you don't recall whether any other contributions were made for that purpose by the State organization during 1938, or while you were in that office in 1939?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. In 1939—wait a minute. That was personal contributions of the staff. No; I do not think there was anything made by the State organization out of its own treasury.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, transactions with the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy: What transactions were there between the State organization and that organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. As I told you, money collected by our branches for Spanish relief and cleared through us.

Mr. WHITLEY. That would be included in the \$50,000 you gave me?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is S. Brooks, Mr. Browder, and what were his relations with the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. At one time he was financial secretary of the Kings County organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. At one time; he is no longer in that position?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He may be, I don't know. He was not for a while.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did he occupy that position at the time you ceased to be treasurer of the organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He did not at that moment.

Mr. WHITLEY. He did not?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know what period he did occupy that position?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Up to some time last fall; I am not sure just when.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you stated David Leeds was the man who took your place?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. As treasurer of the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Max Benson?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The bookkeeper on the ninth floor of the national office.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, to reiterate, Mr. Browder, the figures you have given me here which, to the best of your knowledge, represent the approximate total amount of moneys collected by the State organization during 1938, amount to \$584,000, in round figures. How

does that compare with 1937—the collections or income of the State organization during the period you were treasurer in 1937?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It would be slightly higher, I would say.

Mr. WHITLEY. This \$584,000 figure would be higher?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Fifty to sixty thousand dollars higher.

Mr. WHITLEY. For the same period in 1937?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes. That is a rough figure, but approximately correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. And how does it compare with the period of 5 months that you were State treasurer, in 1939?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. About the same.

Mr. WHITLEY. About the same?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; although, bear in mind, there was no financial drive on, or only for a matter of about 3 or 4 weeks about the first of the year, in January.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is during 1939?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You had not had your financial drive?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. For the Daily Worker and for special contributions?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. And those purposes?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you know of no large sources of income and all of your transactions were handled through these bank accounts?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is all the questions I have in mind, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You did have some safety deposit boxes, did you not?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I had none.

The CHAIRMAN. Either under your name or someone else's name?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I had none under any name.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no knowledge of any safety deposit box kept for the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And none of your transactions were handled in cash?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Very few; only in the sense of petty cash items. I had a petty cash fund of about \$200 in the office at all times. We tried to keep to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Outside of that, it was handled through banks?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. So a sum total of around \$1,200,000 was handled by you there from the time you took over the office until your relationship ceased?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Roughly about, I should say.

Mr. STARNES. That is for one State alone?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. And for a period of time of a little more than 2 years?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Just a little more than 2 years; about 27 months.

Mr. STARNES. Do you have any idea of the total amount of money that is used by the party in this country annually—a rough estimate, based on your long period of service in the party and holding responsible positions and probably handling the largest single State budget in the set-up?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I could not speak for any other but New York State; I have really no idea outside of New York State; but in New York State, our estimate is it runs about \$20 per member per year from all sources.

The CHAIRMAN. \$20 per member per year?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in New York State?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Tell me this: To whom did you send that money for Spanish relief; what organizations, and to what persons?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The persons I would not be able to say, offhand; I don't know them. I sent it to the organization—the North American Committee, and to the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, pretty much as it was specified, you see; it would usually come in to us specified.

Mr. STARNES. Was any of it used for recruiting activities?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. None of this money.

Mr. STARNES. None of this money?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. Some of the money was?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Not that I know of.

Mr. STARNES. You have no knowledge, as your brother, Mr. Earl Browder, said that probably 60 percent of the recruits for the Spanish Loyalist cause were party members?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I would not know of that.

Mr. STARNES. Did you have any connection at all with the sending of volunteers to Spain in that cause?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, did you have anything to do with sponsoring, financing, or otherwise, any visiting groups or delegations to Spain during 1937 or 1938?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. In the early days of 1937, for a period of about 4 weeks, I started the organization of the Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy, and I left that and turned it over to another man at the end of January 1937. I was on it for about 4 weeks.

Mr. STARNES. To whom did you turn it over?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I am trying to think who that was.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know of any delegations that were financed in whole or in part through the party or through contributions the party made to other organizations or delegations to visit Loyalist Spain in 1937 and 1938?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; none.

Mr. STARNES. You know of none whatsoever?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I know of none.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know whether this North American Committee contributed to the aid of Spanish democracy?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I would not know on that.

Mr. STARNES. Who headed that organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I don't know.

Mr. KUNTZ. I just sort of remember the name of Bishop McConnell.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I don't know as to that.

Mr. KUNTZ. I think he was the head of it once; I don't recall.

The CHAIRMAN. How many members did you have in the State of New York?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. How many members?

The CHAIRMAN. Of the party.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. In what year; do you mean at present?

The CHAIRMAN. How many do you have now?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I understand the figure is now 27,000 enrolled.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-seven thousand?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have the names of them; do you keep the names of them?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; we don't.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't keep the names of them?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; they are in the branches.

The CHAIRMAN. The branches are the only place you can get the names?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They do keep a record of the names?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I suppose they do, in order to keep the dues' record.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that they do?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I know that the branch I belong to does.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I know that the branch I belong to does.

The CHAIRMAN. The branch you belong to does keep the names?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the nationality; do you have people of all nationalities in there?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Just about every nationality.

The CHAIRMAN. Just about every nationality?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. No one nationality predominates?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Not to my experience.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever made trips to Russia yourself?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You never have been over there?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever been outside of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Once—a vacation trip in February 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. To where; where did you go?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. To Paris.

The CHAIRMAN. That had nothing to do with the party?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; I went on a vacation and also combined business with pleasure there for the New Masses, hoping to get some writers for them.

The CHAIRMAN. To get some writers in France?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Correspondents.

Mr. STARNES. Did the New Masses sponsor a trip or delegation of any kind or character to Loyalist Spain in 1937 or 1938?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I would not know. I saw nothing in the papers that I remember about it. You see, I had nothing beyond that; no connection with them.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever received any contribution that you have not made a record of in your books?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. That are now available to this committee?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. From any source?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. From any source.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, do you have any relatives other than Earl Browder who work for or occupy any official position with the party?

Mr. KUNTZ. Mr. Chairman, I think that is going rather far afield. I think Mr. Browder, after answering—

The CHAIRMAN. He is just asking if he had any relatives—

Mr. KUNTZ. I have no objection if he answers "yes" or "no"; but it seems to me to go into the family history, and I do not really feel it is in the scope of this committee's hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, there has been some evidence developed here by Mr. Gitlow that I think makes that pertinent now—testimony given under oath here.

Mr. KUNTZ. Mr. Browder has told me he feels any evidence that Mr. Gitlow gave would make it impertinent to this committee here.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Gitlow supported his testimony with documents, and several witnesses we have had recently have not done that.

Mr. KUNTZ. Mr. Gitlow also said he was general secretary of the Communist Party, and I heard Mr. Browder say last night before 20,000 people—

The CHAIRMAN. Are you testifying? Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. KUNTZ. No; I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't know anything about it?

Mr. KUNTZ. I do of general knowledge. I happen to represent the Daily Worker as their lawyer and I know a good deal about their affairs and I heard Mr. Browder last night say—

The CHAIRMAN. You are not testifying now.

Mr. KUNTZ. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it for the purpose of advising your client not to answer that?

Mr. KUNTZ. Well—

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you frame your question with reference to technical matters.

Mr. WHITLEY. I asked Mr. Browder if he had any relatives other than Mr. Earl Browder who were employed by the Communist Party or the Soviet Government, or the Comintern.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no objection to him answering that, have you?

Mr. KUNTZ. Well, it is going rather far afield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is far afield.

Mr. KUNTZ. If I were the witness, I would not answer such a question. I do not think it is fair.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it occurs to the Chair that it would be an important matter if he has a sister or some near relative who was working for the Comintern. It could not possibly hurt him to disclose that fact.

Mr. WHITLEY. Let me rephrase it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, one of the witnesses testified under oath before this committee that a sister of Mr. Earl Browder's, named Margaret Browder, was presently employed in some official capacity in the Soviet Government. Would you like to comment on that?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I am perfectly willing to answer that question.

Mr. KUNTZ. Go ahead and answer, then.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. To the best of my knowledge and belief, it is not correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you like to give any further details as to why it is not correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No. I just think I would know about it if it was so.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where is she at the present time, or what is she doing at the present time?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, I cannot say at this moment, but I have had letters from her off and on.

Mr. STARNES. From where? Where is she, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The last letter I had was from Kansas City in about January or February of this year.

Mr. STARNES. Where was she prior to that time?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, I don't keep a history of her.

Mr. WHITLEY. If she had been in Russia recently, you would know it, would you not?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I think I would.

Mr. WHITLEY. In the last year or two?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has she?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Not to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or Europe?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Not to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would know; you would not have to qualify it, would you?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I do not think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, the accountant has gone up to get some additional records.

The CHAIRMAN. Step aside temporarily, Mr. Browder.

Mr. WHITLEY. I want to call Mr. Carl Marwig, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Come around, Mr. Marwig, and raise your right hand. You solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MARWIG. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF CARL H. MARWIG, ACCOUNTANT FOR THE COMMITTEE**

(The witness was sworn by the chairman.)

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your full name, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. Carl Haviland Marwig.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what is your address, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. 789 East Thirty-fifth Street, Brooklyn, New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where were you born, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. New York City.

Mr. WHITLEY. And when were you born?

Mr. MARWIG. May 12, 1897.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your occupation at the present time, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. Accountant for the Dies committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. And how many years' experience have you had as a public accountant, or in public accounting work, or in private accounting work?

Mr. MARWIG. For the period from October 1, 1919, to April 1922 I was an accountant for the firm of Price, Waterhouse & Co.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is a firm of public accountants?

Mr. MARWIG. That is right. And subsequent to that time I was the State manager of the Merrill Smith State and Commercial Office for the period from April 1, 1922, to February 15, 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Browder, do you and your counsel want to sit closer so you can hear this testimony?

Mr. KUNTZ. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you are entitled to it. Just get a chair and get up close where you can hear.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, your total experience—did you complete your experience?

Mr. MARWIG. Yes; I did.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, you have been engaged in accounting work, either in a public or private capacity—by that I mean making a distinction between working for a public accounting firm and working as an accountant for a private firm—for how many years, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. Approximately 19 years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the witness is qualified to discuss and give the results of his examination.

Mr. CASEY. What is his education?

Mr. WHITLEY. What was your education, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. I am a graduate of Swarthmore Preparatory School, graduating in June 1917; went into the Army in July of that year; honorably discharged April 1919; and, after that, I took a course of accounting and taxes at Columbia University and with the Venaya Accounting Institute at Hartford, Conn.

The CHAIRMAN. He is qualified; proceed.

Mr. WHITLEY. I submit he is qualified to discuss the results of his examination.

Mr. Marwig, have you had occasion to examine the bank account or bank accounts carried in the name of Mr. William Weiner, financial secretary of the Communist Party?

Mr. MARWIG. I have.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what institution is that account carried?

Mr. MARWIG. In the Amalgamated Bank of New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. What did the examination consist of?

Mr. MARWIG. The examination consisted of the examination of the bank record of returned checks which disclosed the sources from which the income was obtained; the examination of credit slips for the discounting of checks at the loan-and-discount department in the bank; an examination of certain canceled checks; canceled checks for a prior period were not examined because they were not available at the bank.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the bank have a system of photographic copies?

Mr. MARWIG. They have a record made, but that was not examined because we did not have time to go into it. So the examination of canceled checks has been limited to the period of about 2 months prior to July.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ascertain from the bank how far back their recardex system went?

Mr. MARWIG. They keep their reels for about 3 or 4 months; that is their statement to us.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Amalgamated Trust Co.?

Mr. MARWIG. That is right; the Amalgamated Bank. After that period they informed us they destroyed them.

The CHAIRMAN. They destroy them after about 3 months?

Mr. MARWIG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it customary in banks to do that?

Mr. MARWIG. It is not customary; it is just solely according to the policy of the bank.

The CHAIRMAN. Do most banks destroy their records after 3 months?

Mr. MARWIG. I believe in many cases it is customary to keep them much longer.

The CHAIRMAN. I know our experience has been that in a number of cases those records are kept as long as 2 or 3 years.

Mr. MARWIG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know any other instance where a bank has destroyed its recardex records within 3 months?

Mr. MARWIG. I do not happen to offhand.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not believe you completed your statement about the length of time for which you examined canceled checks.

Mr. MARWIG. We examined them covering a period of 2 months prior to July 1.

Mr. THOMAS. Of what year?

Mr. MARWIG. This year. That is approximate.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Marwig, for what period did you make an analysis of the account of Mr. William Weiner in the Amalgamated Bank & Trust Co.?

Mr. MARWIG. His account was examined for the period beginning March 29, 1938, to February 28, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is for 1 year?

Mr. MARWIG. That is for a period of 1 year.

Mr. WHITLEY. Twelve months?

Mr. MARWIG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the date of March 29, 1938, represents the date upon which the account was opened?

Mr. MARWIG. It does; it represents the date when the initial deposit was made in the amount of \$1,237.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did your examination determine the total amount of deposits made to that account during that 12-month period?

Mr. MARWIG. It did.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the total amount of those deposits?

Mr. MARWIG. The total amount of the deposits for the—I want to break that down.

Mr. WHITLEY. All right.

Mr. MARWIG. The total deposits for the period ending December 31, 1938, was \$250,935.56.

Mr. WHITLEY. From what period?

Mr. MARWIG. March 29, 1938. That figure is subject to correction to the extent that we examined returned checks during this period, which represents checks that were turned back and eventually made good, so the net deposits amounted to \$232,276.56. The deposits for January and February 1939, gross, were \$52,429.33, subject to the same correction for returned checks, \$434.79, or a net of \$51,994.54, or a total for that period of \$284,271.10.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the total of deposits to that particular account for the 12-month period from March 1938 through February 1939.

Mr. MARWIG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you examine the withdrawals made from that account during the same period?

Mr. MARWIG. We examined the record of withdrawals for the corresponding period. However, the withdrawals, to be more exact, did not begin until April 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. The account was not opened until March 1938, so the withdrawal record would start in April?

Mr. MARWIG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give us the total amount of those?

Mr. MARWIG. The total withdrawals for the period during 1938 was \$224,073.43, and for 2 months during 1939, \$58,454.22, or a total of \$282,527.65.

Mr. WHITLEY. In your examination of the William Weiner account, Mr. Marwig, did you make an examination of returned checks?

Mr. MARWIG. I did.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is, checks which were deposited in the account during that period and then returned to the drawer for some reason or other?

Mr. MARWIG. I did.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give the committee, Mr. Marwig, information concerning those returned checks, that is, by whom they were drawn and the amount of those checks?

Mr. MARWIG. In detail or the total?

Mr. WHITLEY. Give it in totals for the period covered.

Mr. MARWIG. From the period from June 17, 1938, to December 31, 1938, William E. Browder drew checks in favor of William Weiner in the aggregate of \$13,813.85.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those were checks that were not honored at the time they were received?

Mr. MARWIG. That is right; but all of them were subsequently honored.

Sonia Carter, from the period of July 11, 1938, to February 17, 1939, aggregate, \$1,070.69.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. WHITLEY. Checks drawn by Sonia Carter payable to the Weiner account, which were deposited in the Weiner account, for the period from July 1938 to February 1939, checks totaling \$1,070.09.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are deposits, and she was the maker of the checks.

Mr. WHITLEY. She was the drawer and they were returned for some reason or other, but those checks were all, as I understand, subsequently honored.

Mr. MARWIG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. For some reason or other at the time they were deposited they were not accepted, they had not been endorsed, or were not accepted for various reasons.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, I plan to have Mr. Marwig testify concerning his examination, and then I expect to recall Mr. Weiner and have him identify each one of these persons and explain his financial transactions with them.

Will you proceed, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. Samuel Miller—

The CHAIRMAN. Did he not testify that he did not know Samuel Miller?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; he stated he could not identify Mr. Miller, I believe.

The checks are drawn—

Mr. MARWIG. To the order of William Weiner.

Mr. WHITLEY. To the order of William Weiner, and what is the total?

Mr. MARWIG. \$1,215.09.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you positive he testified he did not know Samuel Miller?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is my recollection.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish you would have the stenographer look that up.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes, sir. The checks were not honored at the time they were deposited, but were later honored, all checks drawn by Samuel Miller?

Mr. MARWIG. That is right. Pat Toohey.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the amount of those checks?

Mr. MARWIG. That is drawn in the aggregate of \$589.18.

Literary department.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was for what period?

Mr. MARWIG. From May 1938 to July 1938. The literary department for the period from August to November, \$1,186.73.

Mr. WHITLEY. That means the literary department was the organization that drew the checks.

Mr. MARWIG. I will not repeat the details, to expedite the record.

F. A. Printing Corporation, \$620 during the month of August.

Mr. WHITLEY. 1939?

Mr. MARWIG. 1939.

Cashier's check, April 20, 1938, \$365.48; Morning Freedom Publishing Co., Inc., May 31, 1938, \$1,000. D. Faulkner, July 20, \$112.63; Communist Party, United States of America, November 7, 1938,

\$271.42; M. Ames, August 8, 1939, \$160. Louis Sass, July 3, 1939, \$5. David Leeds, July 14, 1939, \$293.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, Mr. Marwig, in conjunction with your examination, did you examine the certified checks which were drawn on this account?

Mr. MARWIG. We did not inspect the certified checks, but we inspected the bank record of certified checks.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give us a summary of what that examination revealed?

Mr. MARWIG. For the period of June 23, 1938, to July 21, 1938, \$2,100 was received by William Weiner from the People's World.

Mr. WHITLEY. Received by him from the People's World?

Mr. MARWIG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the west-coast publication, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARWIG. Similarly, checks were received in the amount of \$543.31 from Jack Johnstone, during October 1938.

E. H. Neuwald remitted certified checks in the amount of \$185 during November and December 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. Let me get this straight. As to these certified checks, you got your data from the certified-check record of the Amalgamated Bank?

Mr. MARWIG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those are records of checks issued by them?

Mr. MARWIG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And charged against this Weiner account?

Mr. MARWIG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You did not make that clear.

Mr. MARWIG. I am sorry.

Mr. WHITLEY. That the checks were not received by this account but were paid out of this account.

Mr. MARWIG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. They were paid out of the Weiner account and drawn to Jack Johnstone and E. H. Neuwald?

Mr. MARWIG. That is right. I was inadvertently thinking of returned checks.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the next item of certified checks?

Mr. MARWIG. Madison Square Garden received \$3,000 on May 26, 1938, from William Weiner. William F. Dunne received \$250 on June 9, 1938. New Masses received \$900 on June 13, 1938. Al Edwards received \$200 on December 14, 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give the committee, Mr. Marwig, a summary of the results of your examination of canceled checks, just indicating the total amount of the canceled checks and the total to certain individuals?

Mr. MARWIG. William Weiner disbursed to Max Kitzes an aggregate amount of \$27,716.40 for the period from May 19, 1939, to June 24, 1939. The Postal Telegraph & Cable received \$328.45 for the period from May 15, 1939, to August 2, 1939. Lem Harris received \$400 during May and July 1939. I. W. O. received \$104.86 during the month of May 1939.

Gensup Stationery received \$75.57: the New York Telephone Co., from May to June 1939, \$785.91.

Camp Nitgedaiget received \$686.62 from May to July 31, 1939. Katz Cottage received \$2,057.50 during May and June 1939. M. Childs received \$700 during May 1939.

R. F. Hall, \$450 during the month of May. B. Cohen, \$350 in May 1939. World Tourists, \$289.89 from May to August 1939.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe World Tourists is the organization he stated he had had no financial transactions with before.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; he testified to that.

That was \$289.89 paid to World Tourists out of the William Weiner account from May to August 1939?

Mr. MARWIG. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I want you to check the transcript to get his exact words about that.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you proceed?

International Publishers, \$732.98 in May 1939. New Age Publishers, \$55 in May 1939. Russky Golos Book Shop, \$22.30 in May 1939. People's Ink Corporation, \$15.30 in May 1939. A. Ginzburg \$4, June 1939.

Mr. STARNES. When was the R. F. Hall item for \$450 paid?

Mr. MARWIG. As to the R. F. Hall item, the exact date is May 16, 1939, in the amount of \$450.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know the number of that check?

Mr. MARWIG. Yes; it is No. 45.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where was that check cashed?

Mr. MARWIG. At the First National Bank, Birmingham, Ala.

The CHAIRMAN. That was in May?

Mr. MARWIG. May 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you proceed?

Mr. MARWIG. Sol's, \$81.79 from May to July, inclusive. Superintendent of Documents, \$14.50 from May to July 1939, inclusive.

Cash—these checks have been endorsed by Larry Taylor in the aggregate amount of \$15,837.83.

The CHAIRMAN. Weiner testified he did not know whether he knew Larry Taylor or not; that he did not know who he was.

Mr. WHITLEY. He said he had an office boy by the name of Larry, I believe he said he had an office boy whom he knew as Larry who received \$22 a week.

The CHAIRMAN. He endorsed the checks to the total amount of over \$15,000?

Mr. MARWIG. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You asked him positively, Mr. Whitley, if he knew Larry Taylor and he denied it, but finally said he knew somebody by the name of Larry, but did not know whether the name was Taylor. We are going to stop this kind of testifying before the committee. The witnesses are going to tell the truth.

Mr. MARWIG. Those payments were received during the period from June 23 to July 13, 1939.

Workers' Library Publishers, \$2,851.61 for the period from June 6 to July 6. Psychologists' Journal, \$1, May 25.

M. Greenbaum, \$250, July 1939; Prompt Press, \$15, July 5, 1939; the New Republic, \$5, July 5, 1939; Carl Winter, \$350, July 5, 1939; Daily Publishing Co., \$5.00, from June 22 to July 25; W. E. Douglas, \$100, July 12, 1939; L. Davis, \$300, July 11, 1939; John Davis, \$125, July 22, 1939; Cash, \$1,989.94, checks endorsed by William Weiner, July 13, 1939, aggregate amount.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the total amount of checks payable in cash and endorsed by William Weiner in the period from June 19 to July 13.

Mr. MARWIG. That is correct. T. Goldin, \$180, July 11, 1939; J. N. Golos, \$60.12, July 12, 1939; M. Gorma, \$40, July 11, 1939; R. W. Russ, \$30, May 31, 1939; L. H. Jacoby, \$10, May 21, 1939; Rose Warbio, \$10, June 2, 1939; Carl Scherer, \$15, June 6, 1939; Henry Winston, \$99.40, June 1939; Charles Kelner, \$497.38, June to August, inclusive; New Masses, \$500, June 22, 1939; Current History, \$4.25, June 22, 1939; Humanity Guild, \$25, June 22, 1939; Sam Carr, \$1,000, June 20, 1939.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is another item about which there was very uncertain testimony, about Sam Carr, who was believed to be a Canadian.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the record show about Sam Carr?

Mr. MATTHEWS. \$1,000 drawn to the order of Sam Carr.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he not testify definitely that he had no financial relations with Sam Carr?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. He was asked that two or three times.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This check was drawn on a bank in Montreal, Canada.

The CHAIRMAN. As I recall, he was asked whether he was a banker, and he said he did not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you proceed?

Mr. MARWIG. McGibben and Currey, \$85, June 22, 1939; I. J. Morris, \$110, June 22, 1939; Carl Brodsky, \$5.89, June 8, 1939; J. E. Albright Co., \$77, June and July 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Marwig, there is quite a bit more detail on this, and in order to expedite it, Mr. Chairman, if permissible, I will just ask Mr. Marwig to give us data on certain accounts that I will ask him about, which are accounts I will ask Mr. Weiner about later.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have an item, a canceled check payable to the Morning Freiheit, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. I do, in the amount of \$2,000, and it was issued to them on the date June 10, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have an item, a check payable to the Adria Printing Co.?

Mr. MARWIG. There is a check to their order in the amount of \$4,000, dated July 24, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have record of a check payable to the F. & D. Printing Co., Inc.?

Mr. MARWIG. A check in the amount of \$350, dated July 28, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have a check payable to the order of the International Workers' Order?

Mr. MARWIG. A check in the amount of \$171.33, dated July 28, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is another organization, I believe, that Mr. Weiner testified he had no financial transactions with.

The CHAIRMAN. Which one is that?

Mr. WHITLEY. International Workers' Order. I am not sure about that. That is my recollection.

The CHAIRMAN. We want to check each instance in which he testified positively, and where the record contradicts his testimony.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have a record of a check payable to Fred Briehl?

Mr. MARWIG. A check in the amount of \$1,000 dated July 28, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have a check payable to William E. Browder?

Mr. MARWIG. A check in the amount of \$175, dated August 1, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is drawn by Mr. Weiner.

Mr. MARWIG. I believe you skipped one.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which one is that?

Mr. MARWIG. William E. Browder, \$125. That is on the previous page.

Mr. WHITLEY. I did. William E. Browder, in the amount of \$125, dated when?

Mr. MARWIG. Dated July 18, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have an item payable to the New York State Unemployed Insurance Fund?

Mr. MARWIG. A check in the amount of \$330.24, dated July 28, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. And to Harry Hyland?

Mr. MARWIG. For \$100, dated August 9, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, I might state that Mr. Marwig's examination of this and other accounts had to be limited to a definite period. Lack of time and personnel made it impossible to cover all of these accounts as far back as we would like to have covered them.

I might also state that his testimony today will only deal with his examination of the accounts of Mr. William Weiner and of Mr. William E. Browder. Mr. Marwig has made an examination of a total of 43 accounts, but the testimony with reference to those other accounts will be introduced by him later.

I might also say that the 43 accounts examined by Mr. Marwig—

The CHAIRMAN. I was going to suggest, if you want to examine Mr. Browder in connection with these particular items, why not call him now while you have Mr. Marwig on the stand and ask for his explanation of these items?

Mr. WHITLEY. We can do that after we get the preliminary testimony in as to the totals in Mr. Browder's accounts. When we come to the canceled checks, the cashier checks, and the return items, that may expedite matters to have him give his explanation at the time.

Mr. THOMAS. These 43 accounts are those accounts in which deposits were made by the Communist Party or—

Mr. WHITLEY. Those 43 accounts, Mr. Thomas, are accounts of the party or affiliated or subsidiary organizations, covering various publishing corporations and front organizations.

I might state that the total deposits to those 43 accounts, for the period covered, is \$10,164,730.91.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the period covered?

Mr. WHITLEY. That varies. Some of the accounts, such as the one we have just covered, of Mr. Weiner, was opened only in March 1938. Some of them go back several years. It varies. I would say that in no instance did we go back further than 4 or 5 years, Mr. Marwig.

Mr. MARWIG. The Compro Daily is the only account where we went back to either 1932 or 1933.

Mr. WHITLEY. The average years covered would be about 2 or 3, would it not?

Mr. MARWIG. Yes; some of them 2 or 3, and many of them 4½ years.

Mr. WHITLEY. But to continue with Mr. Marwig's testimony, relating to the accounts of William E. Browder, did you have occasion to examine accounts in the name of Mr. Browder?

Mr. MARWIG. I did.

Mr. WHITLEY. What bank accounts in that name did you examine?

Mr. MARWIG. Bank accounts with the Manufacturers' Trust, Amalgamated Bank of New York, and in the Amalgamated Bank of New York there was a regular checking account and a special-interest account.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give us the total deposits made by Mr. William E. Browder in his account in the Manufacturers' Trust Co. and the period covered by your examination?

Mr. MARWIG. The initial deposit was made April 9, 1937, in the amount of \$5,928.79. For the period ending December 31, 1937, net deposits, after returned checks, amounted to \$258,702.48.

Net deposits for the year 1938, \$596,922.58.

For the 3 months ending March 31, 1939, \$156,196.67, or a total of \$1,011,821.73.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, there was deposited in that one account of Mr. William E. Browder, in the Manufacturers' Trust Co., from the period April 1937 through March 1939, a total of \$1,011,821.73?

Mr. MARWIG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. What were the withdrawals from that account for the same period?

Mr. MARWIG. The withdrawals for the period from April 9, 1937, to December 31, 1937, were \$252,048.64.

For the year 1938, \$591,722.11.

For the first 3 months of 1939, \$162,886.24, or a total of \$1,006,656.99.

Mr. WHITLEY. Before we get into the returned checks and certified checks on that account, let us get the totals of the other accounts. Did you have occasion to examine the account in the Amalgamated Bank of New York in the name of Mr. William E. Browder?

Mr. MARWIG. I did.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give us the deposits to that account during the period under examination?

Mr. MARWIG. The deposits to the checking account, net deposits, \$159,809.55. For the period from March 11, 1937, to December 1, 1937.

I might mention that the initial deposit was made March 11, 1937, in the amount of \$15,000. Net deposits during 1938 amounted to \$118,416.70.

For 2 months of 1939, \$6,527.07, or a total of \$284,753.32.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you examine the record of withdrawals during the same period?

Mr. MARWIG. I did.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give us that?

Mr. MARWIG. For the period from March to December, inclusive, \$146,112.67; 1938, \$131,474.14; 3 months of 1939, \$7,162.63, or a total of \$284,749.37.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you examine any other accounts in the name of Mr. William E. Browder at the Amalgamated Bank?

Mr. MARWIG. I did.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give us the record of deposits to that account?

The CHAIRMAN. You mean another account in the Amalgamated Bank?

Mr. WHITLEY. This was a checking account. Mr. Marwig gave the totals of that account. This other is a savings account in the same bank.

The CHAIRMAN. A savings account?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; opened in the same month, March 1937.

Mr. MARWIG. March 20, 1937. The initial deposit was made in the amount of \$5,602.08.

Withdrawals were made from the account during October and December 1937, in the amount of \$5,580; in April 1938, in the amount of \$20.44, or an aggregate amount of \$5,644.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Marwig, can you give us the total of all deposits to the William E. Browder accounts from the period April 1937 through March 1939?

Mr. MARWIG. On the three accounts?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; a period of approximately 2 years.

Mr. MARWIG. The total deposits received in all accounts amounted to \$1,302,177.13. Disbursements were made in the amount of \$1,296,997.80.

The CHAIRMAN. That was all in his personal name?

Mr. MARWIG. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no indication that that was for the Communist Party?

Mr. MARWIG. No indication whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. As far as examining the bank account, it would be just like the bank account of any individual?

Mr. MARWIG. As far as the title of the bank account is concerned, there is no indication. I might mention that in the case of the special interest account it was found that the withdrawals were transferred from the special interest account to the checking account.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the law he evidently accounted for this in his income-tax return, this one-million-and-some-odd-thousand dollars?

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder's income-tax return does not indicate any such amount as having passed through his hands, Mr. Chairman. I do not have the photostatic copy with me for the years 1937 and 1938, but as I recall, he reported income of approximately three or four thousand dollars. I do not remember exactly. I can bring those returns. The only return that he filed as far as I could determine showed an income of under \$5,000 for the 2 years, if my memory is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you happen to know whether the Communist Party of New York State reported an income anything like this amount?

Mr. WHITLEY. No; I do not, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you know whether they reported any income?

Mr. WHITLEY. No; I do not know that, sir. I can find out.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is important.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the accounts carried in that name had a total for 2 years of \$1,302,177.13.

Mr. MARWIG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, do you want me to continue with the data with reference to cashiers' checks and returned items, and canceled checks which were examined?

The CHAIRMAN. Such items as are material to the investigation.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you want me to question Mr. Browder about these items?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. As Mr. Marwig identifies them?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

(Mr. William E. Browder thereupon also took the witness stand.)

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Marwig, in your examination of the returned checks for the William E. Browder account in the Manufacturers Trust Company, did you find accounts or checks drawn by S. Brooks which were deposited in that account?

Mr. MARWIG. I did.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the total of the checks drawn by S. Brooks?

Mr. MARWIG. The total is \$7,601.49.

Mr. WHITLEY. I want to explain, Mr. Chairman, that these are all for just a brief period, comparatively. It is only a period of a few months, for instance, that we were able to examine the canceled checks. It is a cross section and is not all-inclusive, by any means. That was for what period, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. It covered the period from October 15, 1937, to August 3, 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. These returned checks, returned items, were examined for the whole period of the account, in most instances, were they not?

Mr. MARWIG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. But the canceled checks were only examined for a brief period?

Mr. MARWIG. Only for the period when the checks were available while we were working at the bank. That is why the period of examination of the canceled checks is subsequent in most cases to the summaries of the total deposits and withdrawals.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is S. Brooks, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He was the financial secretary of the Kings County organization of the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. And these represent remittances made by him to the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have an item for Morning Freedom Publishing Co., Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. I do.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what amount and for what period?

Mr. MARWIG. \$1,875 for the period from January 29, 1938, to April 11, 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you recall what those payments were for?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Probably repayments of loans. These are checks coming to me?

Mr. WHITLEY. Coming to your account: yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Those are probably repayments of loans, as I remember them.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have an item drawn by Bernard Benn?

Mr. MARWIG. I do.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what amount?

Mr. MARWIG. \$200, dated October 7, 1937.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Bernard Benn, Mr. Browder?

Mr. MARWIG. I think he is one of the employees of the literature department.

Mr. WHITLEY. One of the employees of the literature department?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is my remembrance; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you recall what that \$200 item might have represented?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I am not too sure. I think it might have represented partial repayment of a monetary loan, or something of that sort.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would loans from the literature department be repaid by Mr. Benn—I mean, loans to the literature department?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. They might be.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Irving Cress?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He is the manager of the literature department.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have an item there for him?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Bernard Benn is the assistant manager, by the way.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have an item for Mr. Cress?

Mr. MARWIG. Yes; I have; in the amount of \$600.

Mr. WHITLEY. What date is that?

Mr. MARWIG. Dated November 12, 1937.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Mary Oppen?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. She is the wife of one of our organizers up-State.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would payments come from her?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; she might have sent some money.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was an item in the amount of \$200, I believe?

Mr. MARWIG. \$200, dated November 17, 1937.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is William Nack?

Mr. KUNTZ. May I interrupt? Mr. Browder said up-State. The hearing taking place here, it might mean nothing. You mean up-State New York?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Up-State New York; yes. That name might be William Mack instead of Nack.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is he?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Financial secretary of one of the sections. The check might have cleared through my account from that source.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, where these explanations of names do not require any further comment, I think I will just skip the amounts and ask him to identify the names.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. WHITLEY. Milton Mann?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He is the organizer of, I think it is, the Eighth Assembly District in Manhattan.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Harry Lichtenstein?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Lichtenstein was the financial secretary of the Bronx County organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. And any deposits from him would have come through these collections?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. From his organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. Did you receive those contributions from organizers or from your district financial secretaries?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It is possible that in a few cases an organizer might bring in money direct or might possibly carry the account in his name.

Mr. STARNES. The ordinary routine way, of course, was through your district financial secretary, is that right?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. And on the regular form provided for that purpose?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct. That is from a section or county organization. Usually we dealt directly with counties, occasionally with a section direct.

Mr. STARNES. But the routine—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The routine was with the counties.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have an item on the following page, Mr. Marwig, drawn by William E. Browder?

Mr. MARWIG. I have.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what amount is that?

Mr. MARWIG. \$674.66, dated August 18, 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you recall what that check was, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It sounds to me like a pay-roll check, but that is guessing.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is drawn by you and deposited to your account. In other words, how would a pay-roll check be handled?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I would draw the cash.

Mr. WHITLEY. And meet the current wages of the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. In the office there; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Sam Siegel?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. At one time he was manager of the Jewish Book Store in the Freiheit office, and later he became the manager of a summer camp.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the amount of the item, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. \$437.20, dated November 1, 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would such a payment in that amount to your account from Mr. Siegel represent, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Quite possibly a loan of some sort.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would it be income from any of his activities on behalf of the party?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No. This is a payment, as I understand, by me to him?

Mr. WHITLEY. No; it is a payment, a check drawn by him.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. A check drawn by him to me?

Mr. WHITLEY. Deposited to your account.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Then it would be in the reverse, a payment of a loan, or something of that sort.

Mr. WHITLEY. Repayment of a loan?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Repayment of a loan, or something of that sort.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he active in labor circles, trade unions?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He was very active up to the time he became manager of the camp. I do not suppose that leaves him much time.

Mr. WHITLEY. Well, that is not a full-time, year-round job, is it?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; it is pretty much of a full-time job.

Mr. WHITLEY. What camp is that?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It is a camp that is now known as Lakeland.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where is that located?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Hopewell Junction.

Mr. WHITLEY. New York?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are the camps operated entirely by the State organizations, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The State organization has nothing to do with the operation of the camp.

Mr. WHITLEY. What part does the State organization play in the operation of the camp?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. They permit us to carry on money-raising activities and because of that we frequently have to help them out when they are momentarily in a tight pinch.

Mr. WHITLEY. But the camps are operated entirely by the national headquarters?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The camps are operated, so far as I know, as business institutions.

Mr. WHITLEY. Private enterprises?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. By individuals?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Party members?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Party members.

Mr. WHITLEY. J. E. Albright & Co., who are they?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Is this a check to them or from them?

Mr. WHITLEY. It is a check drawn by J. E. Albright & Co. deposited to your account in the amount of \$150.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I would not remember offhand what it is.

Mr. WHITLEY. What type of business is J. E. Albright engaged in?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The only Albright I know is the company that runs the typewriter repair and second-hand typewriter store on Broadway, which is about two blocks from the office.

Mr. STARNES. Is there any reason why they should be turning money over to you?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Not offhand I could not tell you. I do not remember the item at all.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Adolph Raboff, D. D. S.?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Doctor of dental surgery. It is a New York check, apparently Corn Exchange Bank, \$145 [referring to document]. I do not know him personally. The only thing I can figure is that possibly some section may have used that in making their settlement.

Mr. THOMAS. How much is the amount of that check?

Mr. WHITLEY. \$145, dated January 24, 1938.

Mr. STARNES. Does he have any connection with the party?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I would not know. I do not know the man.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you have any party or organization bank accounts outside of New York City?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; not under my control or with my knowledge.

Mr. WHITLEY. The section or branch might have had some?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. They might have; I would not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Ruth Rolland?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It seems to me that is the name of a girl who was one time financial secretary of a section.

Mr. WHITLEY. In which capacity she would be transmitting funds to the party?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Albert Jackson, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He was the financial secretary of the Harlem division.

Mr. WHITLEY. And any receipts from him—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Would be in the current transactions.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Marwig, under the certified checks for the William E. Browder account in the Manufacturers Trust Co., what does your examination show?

Mr. MARWIG. It shows that funds were disbursed in favor of the Daily Worker amounting to \$15,171.23 during the months of November 1937 and 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is two separate transactions?

Mr. MARWIG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What did those payments represent, Mr. Browder.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Coming at that time of the year, probably partial payments to them of funds raised in the course of the financial drive.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, the State organization put on the financial drive?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Deposited the receipts to its bank account and then made the payment to the Daily Worker?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are there any items of certified checks with reference to payments made to Madison Square Garden, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. An item in the amount of \$4,250 under date of November 13, 1937.

Mr. WHITLEY. What did that payment represent, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The balance of the rental of the hall, under contract, for the following evening, or maybe for that evening; I am not sure of the date exactly.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was for the purpose of a mass meeting or convention?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the Newport Printing Co., Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I cannot remember it offhand. I will see if I can remember it in a minute or two.

Mr. WHITLEY. What does your reference show with reference to the Newport Printing Co., Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. An item of \$600 was made payable to them on July 7, 1928.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I know what it is. It is for the printing of supplies for the financial drive. It was a particular type of coin card that was printed, and I am reasonably sure that was the company.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was the drive which the State put on on July 15?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It began 2 or 3 weeks later. This was probably a deposit on the order.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any payments to the literature department, you previously stated, I believe, would be for literature ordered and sent to the sections or branches and paid for through the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right, except in the cases where I mentioned loans.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, under the canceled check items for the William E. Browder Manufacturers Trust Co. account, Mr. Marwig, do you have items in which S. Randolph is the payee?

Mr. MARWIG. I have.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the total of those?

Mr. MARWIG. \$88; and they were received during April and May 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is S. Randolph, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I do not know S. Randolph. As near as I can guess at this, this would probably be remittances made from the Rochester account, and possibly they went to him and he bought a check—they used him because they had no bank account, rather than buy a postal money order. That is as good a guess as I can make on it. I do not know the person individually.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know him, and do not know why he would be remitting checks in the amount of \$22, or why you would be sending him checks in the amount of \$22 over a period of 4 months?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Wait a minute. I sent him checks?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is Randolph?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. You sent him checks totaling \$88—four checks for \$22 each.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Oh, yes; now I remember it. This was an instructor that we sent there to hold a school for about 4 or 5 weeks. I did not remember his name. We sent him to Rochester. We also had him for a while in Buffalo.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was he to be an instructor in one of the workers' schools?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right; he was to hold a school there.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that was his weekly salary?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. What type of instruction was he to give?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Social economics, history of the party, and such.

Mr. STARNES. What is his regular vocation; teaching?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I don't think so. I am not too sure of this, but if I remember him, he is a factory worker who has specialized on this.

Mr. STARNES. By the way, have you had an opportunity to refresh your recollection about to whom you paid money for the aid of Spanish democracy?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, you see, insofar as possible I like to make the check payable to the organization, and because I did not write the check myself, usually—I only signed it and verified the accuracy of the amount—my memory would apt to be very poor on the subject, and I did not make it my business to know in detail the officers of the organization.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know what organizations handled money for that purpose?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The two organizations principally that I dealt with were the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy and the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. I do not think that I had any considerable transactions with any other organizations.

Mr. STARNES. And is it your recollection that you paid to them the bulk of that \$50,000 that you raised?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is my recollection; yes.

Mr. STARNES. How did you make those payments; by check?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I think almost entirely by check.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, before we continue with these cancelled-check items and the identification of the payees, all of these funds, according to Mr. Marwig, who handled the accounts—in the three accounts all of the receipts for deposits were made under your name as an individual?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. With no identification of the account showing that it was other than a personal account?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you did not include these funds, or a portion of them—or what portion, if any—on your individual income-tax return?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What returns, if any, were made with reference to these funds?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I think that in the course of the election campaign the money raised for the election campaign and spent for the election campaign was reported. That is my remembrance; and other than that, I do not know that any reports were required. I was acting under the advice of the lawyers and accountants on that.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean that they advised you that while you received over a million dollars you did not have to, personally—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER (interposing). Yes; because I am a known character with the bank. May I go into a little detail on that, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. No—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I will tell you why. In the case of the Amalgamated Bank, for instance, we had had to file with them a resolution of the State committee authorizing me to endorse checks for the Communist Party, and also stating, as I remember it, that all such account was the account of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean that you filed that?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In the beginning of your—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER (interposing). That is right. I was required by the Amalgamated Bank to so file it with the Amalgamated Bank. That is, they, as a bank, required that I file such a resolution.

Mr. CASEY. By whom was the resolution passed?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. By the State committee of our party.

Now, when I went to open the account at the Manufacturers Trust, it was my desire to open it as the Communist Party, but the Manufacturers Trust refused to carry it as the Communist Party; they would carry it only as my personal account. I was left with no option on that score.

The two accounts were made to reduce the carrying charges. The carrying charges of the Amalgamated were in my opinion too high, and I transferred over to the Manufacturers Trust for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. And your counsel advised you that it was not necessary for you to report to the Government your gross income and then take such deductions as the law allowed?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right: because everybody knew that my account had none of my personal money in it.

Mr. THOMAS. Why did the Manufacturers Trust refuse to carry the account in the name of the Communist Party?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. You would have to ask the Manufacturers Trust that. They did not tell me. They gave me no reason whatever except the refusal.

Mr. THOMAS. Whom did you see at the Manufacturers Trust?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The manager of the branch at Ninth and University Place, and he made me wait a couple of days before my answer, and then made me file an answer without explanation.

Mr. WHITLEY. They would not honor checks unless they were made payable to you personally?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right. They made that stipulation.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the bank know that this was a Communist Party fund?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Very definitely. I told them that when it was opened.

The CHAIRMAN. They refused to accept the resolution?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. So the bank had only your personal word that they were the funds of the party?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, as to your personal account, where did you carry it?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I have no personal account. I have never had enough money to justify a personal account, and never at any time deposited any personal money in either one of these two accounts.

The CHAIRMAN. No one has ever accounted for any portion of this money except where there was a contribution made during a political year, and that is in compliance with the law that applies to all political parties?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is my understanding of it; yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, let me call your attention to one thing. He did not start this account until March 1937, which was after the general election of 1936, and he closed the account, so far as he was concerned, this year. So there was no national campaign of any consequence for the party to make a report.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The State reports are required, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. In 1938?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But you did not have many State campaign at that, did you?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, we had one pretty good-sized State campaign. They concentrated on one candidate.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, getting off of the identification of these various individuals for the moment, how are the accounts of the State organization handled—entirely by the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Will you clarify that question a little bit further?

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you keep a complete double-entry bookkeeping system for the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Except as applies to accounts payable and accounts receivable. We do not keep accounts payable and accounts receivable. They are handled on a cash basis.

Mr. WHITLEY. And they do not show in your record?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, we set up an estimate at stated periods upon the basis of bills on hand for accounts payable. We have very few accounts receivable.

Mr. THOMAS. If I may interrupt, I would suggest to the committee, for the sake of the record, that we ask the attorney to write this trust company a letter in order to find out what their reason was for not allowing an individual connected with the Communist Party to open an account for the Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. For and on account of the party?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. I think it would be agreeable to the committee to get that information.

Mr. VOORHIS. The bank did not object to having the money?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Not at all.

Mr. CASEY. They did not feel that the money coming from the Communist Party would injure the bank at all?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Not at all. As I say, they gave no reason.

Mr. STARNES. That is, of course, an assumption on your part?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask that such a letter be forwarded to the trust company?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Do you know anything about the size of the New York State budget in relation to the national budget, and the income

of the New York State party in relation to the income of the national party?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I know very little on that score; no. I only know the New York State income. I do not know the national income.

Mr. STARNES. Would you assume that the New York State income is much larger than the national income?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No: in the sense of available funds for the disbursement of the State for its own purposes, I would say no, definitely. But in gross amount it might be larger, considerably larger—in gross amount, considering the amount of transfers that were not a part of our available income.

Mr. VOORHIS. You mean the money that you had to hand over to the national office?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct: either to the national or to the Daily Worker. I set up a special form of accounting; therefore a larger volume is shown on my books.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know who Larry Taylor is—the individual who received a large amount of money—\$15,000?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I know Larry as an office boy on the ninth floor. I mean, he does general work there. He goes to the bank and takes care of all deposits and things of that sort. That is, I won't say all. He may be used for that, and may be used for other things. Whether that is Larry Taylor or not, I am not in a position to say. I don't know that I have ever heard his last name.

Mr. VOORHIS. Does he endorse checks?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He might easily do so, as a messenger.

Mr. WHITLEY. They are made payable to him, I believe.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Let me make something clear on that. The Amalgamated has stated to me at times that they preferred not to cash checks payable to cash, but they would much prefer that they be payable to an individual, and that that individual endorse them. Now, that may be the explanation; I do not know.

Mr. MASON. If they drew a check for \$15,000 in cash, and sent the messenger with a check payable to the messenger, he would have no difficulty in cashing it and bringing back the cash?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That would be my hypothesis.

Mr. VOORHIS. This was not all one check?

Mr. WHITLEY. No; this was a number of checks.

Mr. VOORHIS. How many?

The CHAIRMAN (to the witness). Well, don't you know that practice? You really have a pretty good idea; I mean from your experience in the party and your own position—what they really did was that the party wanted cash, and they would make the check payable to Larry Taylor, and he would go and get the cash and bring it back to the committee and to the individual who wanted to spend the cash.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I repeat, that is my hypothesis.

Mr. VOORHIS. These checks were made out to cash and endorsed by Larry Taylor?

Mr. MARWIG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. They were made out to cash, and in parentheses "Larry Taylor"; is not that correct?

Mr. MARWIG. They were all drawn to cash and they were all endorsed to Larry Taylor, but there was a second endorsement in one case. The

first endorsement was Larry Taylor's. The second endorsement was that of William Weiner.

Mr. THOMAS. How old is this boy Larry Taylor?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. If it is the person I am thinking of, he is a person around 25 or 26 years old.

Mr. STARNES. Frankly, I think this is speculation, and I think we ought to wait until we get Weiner back here.

The CHAIRMAN. I think so. His first answer was that he never heard of a Larry Taylor. Then he came back and said that he knew some office boy by the name of Larry, but he did not know his last name. That is a very positive answer under oath. Now, here is a bunch of checks signed by Larry Taylor, amounting to \$15,000, and one of them is countersigned by Weiner himself. So how are you going to make heads or tails out of a proposition of that sort, where a man testifies under oath to one thing, and here is the record on it?

Go ahead.

Mr. KUNTZ. Mr. Chairman, to keep the record straight, let me say this: We have been talking as if there were one check of \$15,000. I understand from Mr. Marwig that there were 10 checks.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but the point is that Mr. Browder—that he did not know anybody by that name; then he testified that he knew some boy by the name of Larry.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Are you interested in another hypothesis on that, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, there is no use in having hypotheses.

Mr. CASEY. Without a hypothesis, do you know of a man who is an office boy or a messenger whose first name is Larry?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Oh, yes; definitely.

Mr. CASEY. Do you know what his last name is?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; I do not know. I never have known.

Mr. CASEY. Is he a character around the place, well known to the people?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, he would be known to the people who work on that floor. I do not know whether he would be, necessarily, to others in the building. For instance, I worked in the building 2 years, saw him frequently, and did not know his last name.

Mr. CASEY. He was referred to as Larry?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. CASEY. And you would not be surprised to find out that he and Larry Taylor are one and the same?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those checks, amounting to \$15,187.50, Mr. Chairman, were drawn over the period from June 23, or June 29, 1939, to—what is that? Is that supposed to be July 29?

Mr. MARWIG. No; the order just happens to be reversed. The period is from June 23 to July 13.

Mr. WHITLEY. Until July 13; less than a month.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only thing we have a record on?

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the period that was checked—less than a month, and the amount was \$15,187.50.

The CHAIRMAN. All of which indicates that a large part of their funds were drawn out and spent in cash; that is a fact, is it not?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, that was not so on my accounts, but I cannot speak for Mr. Weiner.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you know that most of the party's money is drawn out and spent in cash?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, in the State office it was not so.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know anything about the national office?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I do not know anything about the handling of the national office.

Mr. WHITLEY. Continuing with the canceled checks, Mr. Marwig, we have the Manufacturers Trust account in the name of Mr. William E. Browder. Does your examination show checks payable to William Weiner, and if so, in what amount?

Mr. MARWIG. Checks were drawn to his order aggregating \$3,883.56.

Mr. WHITLEY. Over what period?

Mr. MARWIG. Over the period from April 28, 1939, to May 10, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. A period of 12 days; and checks were made payable to Mr. Weiner by Mr. Browder in the amount of \$3,883.56?

Mr. MARWIG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, how about cash; checks made payable to cash?

Mr. MARWIG. Checks were drawn payable to cash, indorsed by William E. Browder, aggregating \$945.87, from May 4 to May 10, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, those two items—what were those payments to Mr. Weiner identified above, Mr. Browder—almost \$4,000 in a period of 12 days?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. There was a period along in there when we were collecting an unusual amount of money on the sale of the history book.

Mr. WHITLEY. The history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, yes; and the rest of it would be dues payments.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the checks made to cash and indorsed by you from May 4 to May 10, in the amount of \$945.87?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. One of them I can with a reasonable degree of accuracy identify as a pay-roll check, \$586. That is the amount, as I remember, that the pay roll usually ran for the office staff on that floor; that is, everybody that had an office on that floor. And when those pay-roll payments were made, we withdrew the money, subdivided it, put it in envelopes, and distributed it in that way.

Mr. WHITLEY. Were your accounts subject to audit by the auditors of the national headquarters?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; every 30 days.

Mr. WHITLEY. Every 30 days your books of account were audited?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Browder, has your income-tax return been reviewed by the collector of internal revenue in each one of the years, so that you have a card from them stating that your income-tax return was correct?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No: I have received no such card.

Mr. THOMAS. You have never received any such card?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is J. Arozemena?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He is a man of around 40 or so, who ran errands for us there.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any payments to him were in the nature of wages or salary?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Probably. We might occasionally use him for a messenger to go down to the bank and get the pay roll, but I do not think that happened often.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Frank Herron?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He is our county organizer in Erie County—Buffalo.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what would payments be made to him for?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The Buffalo organization was unable to support itself. We gave him stated amounts every week.

Mr. WHITLEY. Payments to S. Schuster; what would they represent?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Payments for certain donations that we had assumed to the Young Communist League.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is S. Schuster identified with the Young Communist League?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. At that time he was the financial secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. And were those payments for obligations in the nature of loans or subsidies?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; that was for obligations that we had assumed.

Mr. WHITLEY. Obligations of the Young Communist League?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Obligations of ourselves, in the form of a donation to the Young Communist League.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is M. Benedict?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The party organizer in Rockland County; I think it is Rockland County.

Mr. WHITLEY. The payments to him would be for—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Wages and so on.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not get that last name.

Mr. WHITLEY. M. Benedict. There are two checks here.

Mr. THOMAS. That is Rockland County, N. Y.?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. There is one check in the amount of \$15, dated April 28, 1939, and another in the amount of \$15,000, dated May 5, 1939.

Mr. THOMAS. Where does he organize up in Rockland County?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Where? Well, as I remember it, his headquarters were in Newburgh.

Mr. THOMAS. Newburgh?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I think so.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, before continuing with these checks, the figure you gave me for 1938, representing all income for the State organization, was \$584,000. You stated that 1937 was a little under that, and that 1939 was—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER (interposing). I think I said 1937 was approximately the same, and 1939 would probably average a little under.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was that it?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I am not sure of that, but it is something like that.

- Mr. WHITLEY. Now, your accounts for the period starting in April 1937 and continuing for 2 years, which would mean the first 3 months in 1939, show a total of \$1,302,177.13 deposited to the three accounts under your control as the State treasurer; and according to your figures for the year 1938, just doubling that for 2 years, which I think would be fair in view of your statement that 1937—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; not bad.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was a little over, and 1939 a little under, maybe—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would make a difference there between your figures and the bank deposits of \$134,177.13. Can you explain the discrepancy?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, you must remember I am speaking from memory.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; I realize that.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. You will have to make allowances for that. It seems to me I came pretty close.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are pretty definite on the large items of income?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. In the one year. But you must keep in mind that there would be variations in those figures too.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be the total figure on that basis—1937, 1938, and 1939?

Mr. WHITLEY. I merely took Mr. Browder's figures for the year 1938 and doubled them. He said that he thought that the receipts in 1937 would run a little over 1938, and that 1939 would run a little under, during the period when he was treasurer in 1939. So I doubled the figure he gave for 1938 and checked it against the total deposits for the three accounts for part of 1937, all of 1938, and the first part of 1939, and it shows that discrepancy.

The CHAIRMAN. What would the total be, taking it from 1937 up to date?

Mr. WHITLEY. The total deposit in the three accounts for the 2 years referred to is \$1,302,177.13.

Mr. KUNTZ. Mr. Chairman, in order to keep the record straight, I think Mr. Whitley asked the question whether his guess would be that the 2 years would be around \$1,200,000, and Mr. Browder stated that would be a fair estimate. And I think that is a pretty good guess.

Mr. CASEY. I think it was some member of the committee who asked that.

Were you requested to bring the books with you?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I was not.

Mr. CASEY. The books are available?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I imagine they are available in the office but I have been out of the office for about 4 months and I could not be sure.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you would not have anything to do with the books now.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. CASEY. But the books are available, are they not?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I assume they are.

Mr. CASEY. You have been testifying from memory; that is all?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Without checking the books.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, who is N. Hustad?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He is party organizer of Nassau County.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is S. Somers?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. S. Somers. I would judge from the amount he is a party organizer. But the name does not identify him at the moment.

Mr. WHITLEY. Max Steinberg.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Max Steinberg is one of staff in the office.

Mr. WHITLEY. And payment to him would be by way of salary?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Possibly by way of salary, or it might be for cash where he had to pay some delivery bills.

Mr. WHITLEY. M. Bronson?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. She is a stenographer on the magazine State of Affairs.

Mr. WHITLEY. Your State publication?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe you have already identified Bernard Benn in the Wholesale Book Corporation.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You stated the Wholesale Book receipts would go to the State organization.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. But there were none during the time you were there.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Offhand, my memory says no.

Mr. WHITLEY. But if there had been any considerable profit from that source you would have known it?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It would have been so remarkable I think I would have remembered it.

Mr. WHITLEY. N. Cruth; who is he?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. County officer, Ithaca, N. Y.

Mr. WHITLEY. Here is a payment to the lawyers' committee of the American Relief, Spain, what organization is that, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I am not too sure of it. The record there probably tells you more than I can.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you give us that amount, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. It indicates the check was drawn in the amount of \$150, dated April 1929, and endorsed by the lawyers' committee of the American Relief for Spain. The second endorsement was David Weiss.

Mr. STARNES. Who is David Weiss?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I don't know him.

Mr. STARNES. You do not know him?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. You cannot give any explanation to the item other than that?

Mr. MARWIG. He is associated with the special lawyers' committee on American Relief for Spain. That is the balance of the endorsement.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I think David Weiss—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). And you do not know what that payment, \$150, to that committee is?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I do not have any direct memory at the moment other than the payment to the committee.

Mr. STARNES. You do not know what it is?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. STARNES. You mean to say that you pay out money in the sum of \$150 to a committee and do not even know what it is for?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is possible. It is possible that I would not know. I do not even remember for the moment, at the time being; when the check was drawn. I cannot say whether it was a donation.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the date of that?

Mr. MARWIG. April 19, 1939.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. April 19.

The CHAIRMAN. Four or five months ago you drew a check to a lawyers' committee and you do not recall and have no knowledge of what it is?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That would be easily possible; I have no definite knowledge of it at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what was the lawyers' committee?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The only thing I would know, or need to know, was that the active political committee of the State had decided to donate \$150, and therefore I had drawn the check to them when I was told to.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you never heard of this check to the committee?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I won't say I never heard of it; I don't remember it. I may be able to recall it if my memory is refreshed, but I don't remember at this moment; no. Possibly we can refer to it later if my memory is refreshed.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Browder, your State organization is one of 42 State organizations?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the total income, as reflected by the deposits at least for the period of 2 years, of \$1,300,000, in round figures—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER (interposing). Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I understand, of course, that the New York State organization is your largest?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever seen any figures, while you were at work in the national headquarters office, in the building, with reference to the total receipts for all the 42 State organizations for the period of a year or 2 years?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; I do not think they have such figures; I do not think the accounts are summarized to that point. They may be. I don't know. I would not be positive.

Mr. WHITLEY. Using even a big discount on that figure because of the fact that New York State organization is the largest of the 42 organizations, even a small portion of that income for the other States would represent a considerable amount of money in a year for all of them.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes; but I could only answer for the one State.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be guessing.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I thought perhaps at national headquarters they did have some figures showing the total income for all of them.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Will you repeat that question?

Mr. WHITLEY. I just stated that I thought perhaps the national organization had figures available showing the total income for all 42 State organizations.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No; they haven't.

Mr. THOMAS. If the other 41 organizations were approximately one-third of the size of the New York organization the approximate income in that year would amount to about \$8,000,000 for all of the 42 organizations, and that would be in addition to the income of the national organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. When Mr. Weiner returns maybe we can get it.

Mr. CASEY. I understand New York represents about one-fourth of the membership.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. A little over one-fourth.

The CHAIRMAN. And the claim is made that they have 100,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Charles Kaufman?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He is an accountant who did some auditing work for me, auditing accounts.

Mr. WHITLEY. For the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. For the State organization: yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Funds paid him would be in connection with employment?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Ben Gordon?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Ben Gordon is the boy who usually handles the arrangements at the Garden.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Alice Colby?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Alice Colby is the mother of Mary Oppen: you will remember the other item.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. She is the wife of an organizer.

Mr. WHITLEY. Why would payment be made to Alice Colby?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Probably for some money requested to be sent.

Mr. WHITLEY. She lives in Oregon?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Where you say probably and possibly you mean you are not sure?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I cannot be definite.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand, when you say possible or probably it means that you are not sure: is that right?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is I. Kufmann, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He is an accountant who has done some auditing work in the different counties.

Mr. WHITLEY. Payments to him were in connection with employment?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Most likely.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is R. W. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. My brother.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he connected with the party?

Mr. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is E. Lyons?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He drives a truck that delivers materials to the various sections of the counties.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is D. Breslo?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He is a binder; he operates a bindery and handles folders and leaflets and things like that.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is I. Adamson?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I do not know about the initial "I." The initial I do not remember.

Mr. WHITLEY. Payment to the Daily Worker would be in the nature of loans, payments, or contributions?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Either loans or contributions.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; a payment in the amount of \$283.15?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Well, that might be advertising some affair.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, where the State organization advertised in the Daily Worker?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. We paid for it.

Mr. WHITLEY. You paid for that advertising?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Arthur Deutsch?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Deutsch; he is a party member. I remember the boy; that is about all I can say. I do not recall any responsible connection at the moment.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mack Gordon?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He is a party organizer in Albany.

Mr. WHITLEY. Abraham Lincoln Brigade Rehabilitation Fund, Inc. What does your examination of that show?

Mr. MARWIG. It was issued to the fund in the amount of \$68.32, May 3, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the nature of that payment, Mr. Browder?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. May 3. I think that was the result of tag day that we didn't get very good results on.

The party members participated in that and the result of that, what came in, were brought through my office.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is this a separate organization, from the Friends of Abraham Lincoln Brigade, or was it a new name, or a name for another organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I think it is a separate organization, but I am not too sure of it.

Mr. WHITLEY. You think it is an entirely separate organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I think it is.

Mr. WHITLEY. When was it set up; do you know?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. When the wounded boys began to come back, if I remember, I think they tried to have a separate fund to take care of that, the cases requiring special hospitalization.

Mr. WHITLEY. And in conjunction with that project you conducted a campaign and solicited contributions?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You handled the funds for the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; you handled that matter as a matter of organization work?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I made it to the organization; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Sherwood Eddy, and what was this payment for, Mr. Browder, in the amount of \$25, on May 3, 1939?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That apparently is some donation; I don't know whether it is in connection with some dinner; we may have bought some dinner tickets.

Mr. WHITLEY. On behalf of the movement to aid Spain?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That would indicate it was probably a dinner given in which we bought 10 or 12 tickets.

Mr. WHITLEY. Taken by the State organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is D'Inzillo?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He is an organizer in Richmond Borough.

Mr. WHITLEY. And Max Benson?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That would be a payment made to the national office.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is Max Benson a member of the national force?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. He is a member of the national force.

Mr. WHITLEY. In what capacity?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I think he works on the books; he is in the finance department.

Mr. WHITLEY. Why would the check be made to him instead of to the national office, to the treasurer?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I can only guess that it was in the absence of Mr. Weiner.

Mr. WHITLEY. And he would be in charge?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that would be a contribution to the national office?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. I mean for dues?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It is possibly a partial payment of dues.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. Who is Sam Bard?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Sam Bard was one of the officers in the Friends of Abraham Lincoln Brigade; what his position was I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the item with respect to that, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. The check shows in the amount of \$557.99 under date of May 6, 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you recall what that payment was for?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. On May 6, 1939. I think that was in connection with—had to do with tag day.

Mr. WHITLEY. Whether it was the result of the tax-day campaign or not, the amount of funds raised by the State organization were given or donated to that organization?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is G. Hochberg? I believe you have identified him as being connected with the Gensup Stationery Co.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That was probably the \$300, that was probably some kind of a payment—

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, an explanation like that does not mean anything unless you know.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I could not say without checking it up.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't remember. Where you do not remember say so.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. All right.

Mr. STARNES. Or give your best judgment.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, that completes the check with reference to this one account, before we get to the others. The only thing he could identify these individual organizations in some instances.

The CHAIRMAN. Then we will meet at 10:30 tomorrow?

Mr. WHITLEY. I think we can finish this in about an hour.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, you want me to stay over until tomorrow for 1 hour? It will be very much help to me if you can conclude this evening. I have a lot of things of my own to do tomorrow.

Mr. WHITLEY. I think there are a lot of these individual organizations that an analysis of the account would show are duplications, of previous items and I think perhaps we can identify them, and complete possibly within a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Marwig has already given the figures on the William E. Browder checking account in the Amalgamated Bank.

The total deposit for the period of two years for that represented \$284,753.32.

Now the return checks on that account will you give us, Mr. Marwig?

Mr. MARWIG. The returned checks received in that account to \$811 for the period from April 21 to July 27; that is April 21, 1937, to July 27, 1938.

Mr. WHITLEY. What do they represent?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Repayment of loans.

Mr. MARWIG. That is for deposit.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I suppose payment of loans.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the same applies in the account of the publishing company, the same thing applies?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is S. Broth?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Financial secretary of Kings County at that time.

Mr. WHITLEY. And Sexton & White?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. White. I do not know, unless somebody got them to issue a check for them because they could not get them wholesale.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Theodore Maki?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Maki. The amount of check would indicate financial secretary of a section, but I can't place him.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Walter Lewis?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Lewis was financial secretary for a while of New York County.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any funds that were transmitted by him would be—

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Organizers funds.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. Now, who is I. W. O., W. N. Y.; what would that be? Is that the Western New York district; is that what W. N. Y. stands for?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would be the nature of that payment from the I. W. O.?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. One of two things: Either a payment, that is usually by a check, by our organizer in Buffalo, or it could be—well, I am having some little difficulty with that check.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the payment to Madison Square Garden, you have already explained that.

Mr. BROWDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is Gene Fisher?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I can't remember the person.

Mr. WHITLEY. You cannot remember?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. No. I will try to remember in a minute or two, but Gene Fisher—yes; he was temporary finance secretary of the Bronx County while Lichtenstein was on vacation.

Mr. WHITLEY. Why would he be paid \$378.50?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. During what period?

Mr. WHITLEY. May 9, 1939.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. \$378!

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. That is going the wrong way. I am trying to recall why that would be.

Mr. WHITLEY. If he was an organizer, he would be paying to you.

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. The finance secretary should send me money; I am not sure.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. It is possible that it might be a matter of—

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you do not know?

Mr. WILLIAM E. BROWDER. I do not remember.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. WHITLEY. There are several duplications in these items, Mr. Chairman. I think that has covered it pretty well, and I will not go into the others.

That is all unless you have some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions by members of the committee?

Mr. KUNTZ. Does that mean we can go back to New York?

The CHAIRMAN. Unless there are some further questions.

Mr. KUNTZ. We are always available if needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand adjourned until 10:30 o'clock tomorrow.

(Thereupon at 4:25 p. m., an adjournment was taken until 10:30 a. m. of the following day, Wednesday, September 13, 1939.)



# INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

---

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1939

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., in the caucus room, House Office Building, Hon. Martin Dies (chairman) presiding.

Present: Messrs Dies, Starnes, Voorhis, Casey, Mason, and Thomas.

Also present: Mr. Rhea Whitley, counsel to the committee, and J. B. Matthews, Director of Research.

## TESTIMONY OF ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG, SECRETARY AND TREASURER, INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

(The witness was sworn by the chairman.)

THE CHAIRMAN. Will you please speak loud and distinct enough so everyone can hear?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

MR. WHITLEY. Mr. Trachtenberg, what is your full name?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. Alexander Trachtenberg.

MR. WHITLEY. Have you ever gone under, or been known by, any other names?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. No.

MR. WHITLEY. What is your present address?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. Business address, 381 Fourth Avenue; residence address, 114 Sixteenth Street, New York City.

MR. WHITLEY. Where were you born, Mr. Trachtenberg?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. In Russia.

MR. WHITLEY. In Russia?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

MR. WHITLEY. When were you born?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. November 23, 1884.

MR. WHITLEY. Were you in the World War?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. No.

MR. WHITLEY. Are you married or single?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. Single.

MR. WHITLEY. Have you ever been arrested in the United States or elsewhere?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. No.

MR. WHITLEY. What was the answer to that question?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. No.

MR. WHITLEY. When did you leave your native country?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. In 1906.

Mr. WHITLEY. And where did you go from there?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To the United States.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was the port of entry?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. And when did you enter at the port of New York?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. August 6, 1906.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where have you lived in the United States, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. New York State and Connecticut State.

Mr. WHITLEY. What occupations have you followed?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. From 1908 to 1915 I was a student in three universities, including Yale, and after that I was invited to teach in the Rand School of Social Science, and headed the research department of that institution; that was up to 1920.

In 1920 I became chief statistician of the International Ladies Garment Union, in New York, up until '21, and at the end of 1922 I resigned and went abroad to travel about a year and a half, and I came back and I lectured through the country for about a year.

Then, in 1924, I organized, or helped to organize, the International Publishers Co., with which I was connected since then for 15 years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you a citizen of the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. When and where were you naturalized?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In New Haven, in 1913; New Haven district court.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Trachtenberg, how long have you been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Since the end of 1921.

Mr. WHITLEY. Since the end of 1921?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; prior to that I was a Socialist.

Mr. WHITLEY. What positions have you held in the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Member of the national committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. For how long?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Since 1921.

Mr. WHITLEY. Member of the national committee since 1921?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other positions?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Off and on, certain subcommittees.

Mr. WHITLEY. Off and on what?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. On certain subcommittees; whatever the situation required.

Mr. WHITLEY. Can you name some of them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Primarily, since my activities were in the literature field, the literature committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have been a member of the literature committee?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long have you been a member of that committee?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. For a number of years.

Mr. WHITLEY. For a number of years?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say as many as 10?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Possibly; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Possibly 10?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what other committees or positions, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is the only one.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the only one?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever been a member of the political committee of the party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I was.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you at present a member of the political committee?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. When were you a member of the political committee?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Between the year of 1923—I should say, rather, 1924—to about 1929.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Were you ever a member of the secretariat?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were a member of the political committee at the same time Mr. Gitlow was a member, were you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, in addition to the positions you have held in the party, what other organizations have you belonged to or do you belong to at the present time, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None.

Mr. WHITLEY. None?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I belonged, before, to the teachers' union when I was teaching.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not belong to any other organization now?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Other than the Communist Party at the present time?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your present connection or position with the International Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am manager, editor, salesman—all of the activities.

Mr. WHITLEY. You just run the whole thing?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. With Mr. Heller, Mr. A. A. Heller, who is the owner of the publication.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is the owner?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your present salary as manager of the International Publishing Co.?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It ranges from \$75 down to about \$40.

Mr. WHITLEY. \$40 a week?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any other source of income, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None.

Mr. WHITLEY. And where do you maintain your personal bank account?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Maintain what?

Mr. WHITLEY. Your personal bank account.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. My personal banking account—I have a savings account in the savings bank; that is in my personal name.

Mr. WHITLEY. And where is that located?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is located at the Central Savings Bank, Fourteenth and Union Square.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not have a personal checking account?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Trachtenberg——

Mr. TRACHTENBERG (interposing). I have a savings account, and an account in my name belonging to the firm.

Mr. WHITLEY. Well, we will get to the firm account later.

When was the International Publishing Co.—it is incorporated, is it not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. When was it founded or incorporated?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In 1924.

Mr. WHITLEY. In 1924?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And who were the parties, the incorporators?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Mr. Heller and myself and Mr. Heller's wife.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those were the three incorporators?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who were the first officers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The same.

Mr. WHITLEY. The same?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And who were the directors at the time it was incorporated?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The same.

Mr. WHITLEY. And who are the present officers in the corporation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Mr. Heller and myself.

Mr. WHITLEY. What position does Mr. Heller occupy?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. President.

Mr. WHITLEY. The president?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what position do you occupy; general manager?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Secretary and treasurer.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now what was the authorized capital stock of the corporation at the time it was incorporated?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. \$50,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. \$50,000; and how much of that stock was subscribed?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. All of it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes. Who took that stock—who bought the stock?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Mr. Heller.

Mr. WHITLEY. How much did he buy; the whole thing?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, it was over a period of years; the investments were, probably, the first year, only \$5,000; the second year,

about \$7,000; and so on, along a period of 15 years, the stock has been subscribed.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not altogether at once.

Mr. WHITLEY. Has it all been subscribed at the present time?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And Mr. Heller owns all of it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Mr. Heller and myself.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the relative proportion?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is about the same.

Mr. WHITLEY. About 50 percent each?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. \$25,000 each?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are there any other stockholders?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None.

Mr. WHITLEY. And that stock is held in your name and Mr. Heller's name?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And no other individuals or organizations have ever held any of the stock other than yourself.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the business of the publishing company; what character of material do they publish?

Mr. WHITLEY. I am getting to that now, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you explain to the committee why the corporation was organized and what its purpose was and just what field it covers in the publishers' field?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; Mr. Heller and myself were working together in the Rand School of Social Science some 25 or 26 years ago, he, as a member of the board of directors and myself as an instructor and as head of the public-research department.

Mr. Heller is a very wealthy man, who for many years in this country, for about 40 years, since he has lived here, has been interested in the progressive movement in this country, particularly with the publishing activities.

And, in 1924 we got together and organized this firm for the purpose of publishing translations, principally of the classics; and other books of interest to the American people and we have engaged regularly in publishing activities, that is in publishing books, books on economics and politics, philosophy, arts and sciences, and novels and new fiction, and books about music, theaters, and so forth, and various phases of publication, regular publishing activities. We publish books of our own and publish books from various other publishers, usually under our name.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Now, do you have your own printing facilities or do you have your printing done on a contract basis, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No printing facilities.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just editorial work?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right; preparation of manuscript and editorial work.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Just as the publication in America is done on that basis.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, in the past year how many books has the International Publishing Co., Inc., published? And give us the name, title of the books, Mr. Trachtenberg.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't remember—I should say we have published about 40 or 50. I imagine, both new and publications which continue, because most of the books are the classics which continue to be published, the kind of books that will be published long after you and I have been gone from this world, like Shakespeare, and books of that kind.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you published any books of Shakespeare this year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No Shakespeare books this year.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are the names of some of them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think I can give them. I have a catalog here, if I may refresh my recollection of the titles published during the year.

You refer to 1939 or 1938?

Mr. WHITLEY. Let us take 1939 first and get back later to 1938.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. 1939 we published a book by Browder, *Fight for Peace*, a recent book he published in the political field.

Translation of a book by Mr. Jackson on Dickens.

Mr. WHITLEY. By Mr. Jackson?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. By Mr. Jackson; an English author.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is his first name?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. T. A. Jackson.

Mr. WHITLEY. T. A. Jackson?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what was the title of that book, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The title of that book is Dickens.

Mr. WHITLEY. Dickens?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; it is a critical volume of his writings.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is there any other title?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No other title.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just a critical volume?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of the English novels of Dickens.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; and what other books?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We published a book by Robert Fox.

Mr. WHITLEY. An American author?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; a British author.

Mr. WHITLEY. A British author?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

We published a collection of essays on Thomas Paine by Mr. James S. Allen.

Mr. WHITLEY. An American author?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. An American author on an American. Then we published—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). Have you published any books of Mr. William Z. Foster?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not this year—at the very beginning of the year we published *Pages From a Workers Life*, by William Z. Foster, a biographical study of Mr. Foster's early life.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As a worker in various industries, cement, and car worker; mostly stories, sketches of his life.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you published the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. This year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is this year.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many copies of that book were published?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The first edition was 100,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. One hundred thousand?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe Mr. Browder said there were 100,000 members of the Communist Party, approximately.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Through what agencies do you distribute those books, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We have about, I should say, about 700 accounts, book stores.

Mr. WHITLEY. Book stores?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are they Communist Party book stores?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Some of them.

Mr. WHITLEY. Some of them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Probably not more than about 10 percent, I should imagine.

Mr. WHITLEY. And has the Communist Party contracted for any volume of those books, too?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not the party; various book stores.

Mr. WHITLEY. Book shops?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you sold directly to State organizations for distribution?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They were sold directly to the book shops; we deal directly with the book shops.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you published any of Stalin's books or works in the past year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In the past year?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; we published a report of his made in March.

Mr. WHITLEY. A report; was it a book?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In pamphlet form.

Mr. WHITLEY. What percentage of your publications are in book form and what percentage are in pamphlet form. Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I should say about 90 percent are books.

Mr. WHITLEY. Ninety percent are books?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you do a great deal of pamphlet business?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; unless you mean printed books in paper-bound copy form—that is, paper editions: but they are not pamphlet.

Mr. THOMAS. Are you going to develop something about this report that he published this year of Stalin; what kind of report it is?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; what was the report of Stalin that you published, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Stalin's report made in March of this year, before the Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Where did you obtain the material for that publication?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. From a printed report published in the Soviet Union.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you obtain it through the official Soviet Union sources or through private sources?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; it was on sale over here in this country.

Mr. WHITLEY. And how many copies of that did you publish?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think the total publication up to the present time—there have been about two or three editions—the total probably would run into 50,000, I imagine, by this time.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who actually did the printing of that pamphlet for you, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. This particular pamphlet?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Most of the printing is done by one firm—Van Rees Press.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is done under contract by you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. On a contract basis.

Mr. WHITLEY. What other publishers?

Mr. STARNES. They publish most of your publications?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. What percentage?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I should imagine that they have done about 99 percent; sometimes another printer will offer to print for less, but most of the printing is done by Van Rees Press.

Mr. STARNES. How did you happen to publish this particular report?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I publish all the classic works and writings of Stalin.

Mr. STARNES. And everything that Stalin says?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not everything.

Mr. STARNES. How did you happen to publish this report?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We publish all his reports, especially.

Mr. STARNES. You have published all his reports?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Assembled in volumes; we have already published two volumes of his writings on Lenin; this also will be included in a volume, which will be published.

Mr. STARNES. Now since this has been discussed with the committee can you now say what company published this particular report for you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. What printing company?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Printed it for me?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As I said, I think the Van Rees Press.

Mr. STARNES. That is your best recollection?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is my best recollection; I would have to look at the record and I have no records with me.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many of Mr. Browder's works have you published, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think this is the third book I published.

Mr. WHITLEY. The third?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Three altogether.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; how many of Mr. Stalin's works have you published?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We have two volumes and we have on several occasions published several pamphlets later to be assembled in another volume; that is up to the present.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, Mr. Trachtenberg, what kind of working or business arrangement did you have for securing the material from the Russian authors, what was done to obtain those works and publications in this country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We received some of those through England, where they were published and sold by an arrangement with the publishing house, Allen & Unwin, one of the publishing houses in England, probably 100 years old.

Another, Lawrence & Wishart. They bring out some publication and send sheets, and vice versa they will secure sheets from us.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Because the sale of this volume is not very large and necessarily it does not pay to publish it, and where it is published in England we secure sheets for use in the publication of the edition we run.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have mentioned the English publishers; you have a working basis with them. Do you have a similar working basis with the Soviet Publishing concerns?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. On what basis?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. On a buying and selling basis.

Mr. WHITLEY. Buying and selling basis?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You buy from them and sell to them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What percentage of the books published by the International Publishers Co. are printed in Russia by the Official Soviet Press, or its officials, and that you get in loose-leaf form for the International Publishers, Inc.?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We do not buy any publications from the Official Soviet Press.

Mr. WHITLEY. From any other press of the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Besides the official press.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. There is a publishing organization called the Cooperative Publishers of Stalin's Works in the Union of Soviet Russia; this is a cooperative establishment of workers that are working there from various nations, who come to the Soviet Nation to work, and not being able to read the Russian language have a publication in various languages, like English, French, and German, and some of the different publications we have gotten through contact with them, and on several occasions their publications are in sheets.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. And we print a certain number of copies.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, you place an order with that concern in Russia.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. For the publication; number of copies of the works.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And they print them for you.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; that is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And send them to you over here.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that concern still in operation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is still in existence. It has been reorganized and is now called the Foreign Publishing Cooperative Society, under a different name.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is the same thing?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The same thing.

Mr. WHITLEY. A private concern.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. A cooperative enterprise of different foreign people that are working there.

Mr. WHITLEY. What part did the Comintern play in that organization; what was the connection between them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know of any connection.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. By the way, it is published, mostly, not in Russian.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not published in Russian?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Mostly, translations of German, the classics on Marxism, and so forth.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Now, you have not given me the percentage of the number of volumes you have obtained in that manner.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would estimate that it would run about 10 percent.

Mr. WHITLEY. About 10 percent?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of the number of books published in this country.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what is the cost of those publications to you; what is the cost to the International Publishing Co. as compared to what it would cost to have the same printing done in this country under the wage scale prevailing in the United States, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Our importation from that source, I estimate, amounts to about 10 percent of our total publications; the books which we import from them make a small quantity of each title, and where it is done under that way, where there is a small edition, say of 500 or 1,000 copies, it does not pay to print an edition of that small number.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. And the importer is able to get the copies—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). Still you have not answered my question, Mr. Trachtenberg. What is the cost of those importations, for instance, in loose-leaf form, to the International Publishing Co., as compared to what the cost would be if printed in this country under the prevailing wage scale, usual printing wage scale, approximately?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If you were to publish the same size of an edition, on an economical basis, say an edition of 3,000 volumes, I would say the cost of that, you would have to pay for printing and binding, would be less.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is, where they are furnished to you in small quantities. But the duty, for instance, on loose leaf is less than it is on a bound book?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not now. It used to be 15 percent; and 25 percent on bound books, but now it is 7½ percent on books.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what was your account, what was the total amount of your financial transactions, that is, your payment to the Soviet organization, this organization in the Soviet Union, during the past year, for such purposes?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, I would say about, perhaps, three or four thousand dollars.

Mr. WHITLEY. Three or four thousand dollars?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Then you have paid them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. For purchases from them.

Mr. WHITLEY. Volumes that are published in sheet forms, printed and sent to you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. If it cost as much or more to do it as indicated, by having them sent here, I would like to know why it is done in that way.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As I explained before, if it were possible to have an issue which amounted to say 3,000 copies it would not be economical to import them, but when we can import about 500 sheets, or a thousand sheets it is more economical to import them, whether from Russia or from England or from some other place.

Mr. CASEY. Even though it costs more.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; because the investment is less; the investment where you have to print a book, say with 500 copies.

Mr. WHITLEY. But they have pretty much the same arrangement?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Because they furnish the use of the publication; that is what it amounts to.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, how many books do you publish in this country, or print, and ship to the Soviet Union, or to this concern?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. All of our books are exportable. We have exported probably, as far as our titles go, at least 80 percent of our books have been exported to various countries abroad.

Mr. WHITLEY. Well, how many to the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I should say the same number.

Mr. WHITLEY. The same number, approximately?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In different countries—100 copies, 200 copies, and so on.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that just an exchange proposition?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. They give you so many of their books and you give them so many of your books?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is just a credit proposition?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; but also paying cash as well. It depends on their orders.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you don't do both in the same transaction?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; not in the same transaction.

Mr. WHITLEY. If they send you three or four thousand dollars of material over here, you send them approximately the same amount?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; not at the same time. I send them as they order.

Mr. WHITLEY. You send them as they order?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; sometimes they accumulate for 6 months, and we send them subject to order.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, does the International Publishers have any branches in the United States, or elsewhere, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It has no branches.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just the one office?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. The one office in New York City?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does the International Publishers—are there any foreign interests of any kind identified with or connected with the International Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No interest excepting firms with which we are dealing.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just a business relationship?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Trachtenberg, how many trips have you made to Moscow, or to Russia, since the International Publishers was founded? Just name them and give us the date, or the approximate date.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes, sir. 1929—

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that your first one?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right. 1931, 1933, 1935, 1937, 1938, 1939. These are trips to Europe, including the Soviet Union.

Mr. WHITLEY. But did you go to the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, were those trips pleasure trips, or were they trips on business for the International Publishers, or trips on business for the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. All three were included in some trips.

Mr. WHITLEY. All three?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; and one trip for the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. One trip for the Communist Party exclusively?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the others were combination trips?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Business and pleasure, and sometimes only business.

Mr. WHITLEY. Sometimes only business?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes. Unfortunately, none of the trips were for pleasure only, but business.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Have you personally, Mr. Trachtenberg, ever held any official position with the Comintern, or with the Soviet Government?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None whatsoever.

Mr. WHITLEY. None whatsoever?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. No connection?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No connection.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. And these trips were all just combination pleasure and business?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Business with both England and the Soviet Union. We deal with about 14 publishers abroad.

Mr. WHITLEY. Fourteen publishers abroad?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are they all in the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. One in the Soviet Union and 13 in England.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any connection or have you ever had any connection with the Amtorg or Russian Trading Corporation in this country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. None whatever?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Officially, or otherwise?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Getting back to the business of the International Publishers, Mr. Trachtenberg, what is the relationship between the International Publishing Co. and the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As far as the firm is concerned, buyer and seller.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just as buyer and seller?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the average volume of business you do with the Communist Party or any of its affiliates or branches in the United States, in the course of a year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, I answered your inquiry, I think, and I might as well consult the letter I sent to you as to the volume of business. We had none with the Communist Party during the years you inquired about—1937, 1938, or 1939.

Mr. WHITLEY. None with the Communist Party as such?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As such; no.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, with what branches, or affiliate or subsidiary organizations of the Communist Party have you had business dealings?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Business with the Daily Worker. In 1937, we sold them books for premiums amounting to \$1,562.50; in 1938, \$38.17; 1939, none.

Workers' Library Publishers, which is a national distributing organization as well as a publishing organization—

Mr. WHITLEY. Incidentally, is the Workers' Library Publishers—that is the same as the literature department of the Communist Party, is it not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They are publishing for the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. And as chairman of the literature committee of the Communist Party, is the Workers' Library Publishers, or literature department, under your control?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Under the control of that committee?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have nothing to do with them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; not the Library Publishers.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is called the literature department——

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; it is not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Or Cooperative Corporation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; it is not. The Publishing Corporation is a corporation of its own.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes; but I believe one witness yesterday, when asked to identify the literature department of the Communist Party, said it was the same as the Library Publishers; he said they were synonymous.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The Workers' Library Publishers publishes and distributes books for the Communist Party, but the literature department of the Communist Party, or the literature committee of the Communist Party——

Mr. WHITLEY. Is the literature department the same as the literature committee?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you are chairman of that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And in that capacity, or, rather, that committee dictates the policies of the party insofar as the publication and distribution of literature is concerned?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. It does not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would the literature committee do?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The literature committee carries out such plans as the education department of the Communist Party lays out.

Mr. STARNES. Who is head of the educational department?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. There is the education committee; there is Mr. A. Landy.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are you connected with the education committee?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. STARNES. Is he the only member?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. He is in charge.

Mr. STARNES. He is in charge?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of the department.

Mr. STARNES. Who are the other members?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know who are the other members; I don't think there is more than just the department, the education department.

Mr. STARNES. As far as the education department is concerned, he is "it"?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right—the department.

Mr. WHITLEY. And as far as the literature committee is concerned, who is on that committee besides yourself?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Myself and Mr. Douglas and Mr. Field.

Mr. STARNES. What Mr. Douglas?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Mr. Douglas, who is in charge of the Workers' Library Publishers.

Mr. STARNES. I know; but what is his given name?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, his given name—I think Walter E. Douglas; no, Wallace E. Douglas.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is Field's first name?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Joseph Field.

Mr. WHITLEY. Joseph Field?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Getting back to your business relations with the Communist Party or any of its affiliate or subsidiary organizations, such as the Workers' Library Publishers—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. I believe in your letter to me, in response to my inquiry, you stated that during 1937 you did \$1,400 worth of business with them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. You see, your letter required to state how much money I received from the Workers' Library Publishers rather than how much business was done.

Mr. WHITLEY. Well, what would be the difference, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The difference is you do business on credit, naturally, and during the year you don't collect all that you sold. The practice in business—

Mr. WHITLEY. Well, that credit: To what extent do you extend credit to the Workers' Library Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh—

Mr. WHITLEY. Approximately, what is the average balance they owe you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, they owe—sometimes it is accumulated for a year—sometimes \$10,000, I should say.

Mr. WHITLEY. Sometimes they owe you as much as \$10,000?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. For publications you have sold them on credit?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And how are those credit transactions handled; do they give you any security?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They give you notes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do they pay you interest?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No interest.

Mr. WHITLEY. No interest?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is just a friendly relationship?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right. We are extending credit sometimes now to 9 months and 10 months' credit.

Mr. WHITLEY. Sometimes those credits run up to what period of time before they are paid—several years?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The general extension is about 9 to 10 months' credit.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the average time it takes them to pay?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Trachtenberg, do you extend the same kind of credit, without interest, to other organizations?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Without interest; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. You do?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. What are some of the other organizations to which you extend credit without interest?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To book stores generally throughout the country. I never heard of a book store paying interest on credit. It is good when you collect what they owe you, rather than to ask interest.

Mr. THOMAS. Do they owe you as much as this particular concern?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; this is a wholesaler—a national wholesale and distributing organization.

Mr. THOMAS. It is a much larger concern than the others?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. The New York organization sells more than this particular national organization does.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, during 1938 you received cash of \$12,959.61 from the Workers' Library Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is just the cash received; it does not take into consideration what credits you extended?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which you say sometimes amount to as high as \$10,000?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. During 1939, you received \$4,803 from the Workers' Library Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Cash received?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. That does not include credits extended?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, the Wholesale Book Corporation, which I believe Mr. William Browder testified was the literature organization of the State—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of the State organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. The New York State organization?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Your business, the cash received from that source during 1937, was \$31,350?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does that figure include credits extended?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. These amounts here are not—it is about what they bought during that year.

Mr. WHITLEY. They pay up pretty well?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They just buy about \$30,000. It is probably about what they purchased during that year, but they pay for the year previous.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what is the largest credit balance ever due you by the Wholesale Book Corporation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, it will run up also to about \$10,000 or \$12,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. That credit extends over what period?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I can give it accurately by our purchase account; around \$2,000 or \$3,000 a month, and it runs up for four or five or six months. That depends on how many liquidate.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do they give you any security for the obligation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They are the best customers. Never any security. It is slow paying, but they always pay.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any concern taking in as much money as they take in, you figure it is a good credit risk, do you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I never figure to lose money on this. I have lost on other book shops, but not here.

Mr. WHITLEY. During 1938, you received cash from the Wholesale Book Corporation of \$48,200?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which represents purchases made the previous year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And during 1939, to the date of this letter, I presume—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Which was August 8, 1939, they had paid you \$7,500 for purchases?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To the end of June; yes. Business declined this year quite considerably.

Mr. WHITLEY. That account does not take into consideration purchases made on credit?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; it does not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, who are some of your other good customers, Mr. Trachtenberg—I mean where you do business commensurate with those concerns?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, not as much. These are the biggest customers.

Mr. WHITLEY. Your largest customers are the Wholesale Book Co. and the Workers' Library Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The third largest, I would say, is England.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who do you sell to in England?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Lawrence & Wishart, primarily.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what is the average volume of sales, again, to the Soviet agency, or to the agency in the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The Cooperative Publishers.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that the name of it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. The Cooperative Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. But since 1938, their distribution, that is, the sale of their publications, was turned over to what is known as the International Book Store, was recently turned over to the International Book Store, which buys and publishes—which buys and sells publications.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is, the International Book Store is in the Soviet Union and is a private enterprise?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As far as I know, it is a regular book store.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is a regular book store?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. And they buy here publications and they sell here publications and we buy these books.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know of any other publishing organizations or book stores in the Soviet Union that are not affiliated with or under the direction of the Soviet Government, in addition to the International Book Store you have referred to?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You don't know of any others?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I don't know of any others.

Mr. WHITLEY. As far as you know, that is the only one that is just a private corporation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the International Book Store—of course there is no official connection or relationship between that and the International Publishers of this country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None whatsoever, except buyer and seller.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just buyer and seller?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what are the sources of income for the International Publishers—solely from the sale of book publishing?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. From the sale of books and such investments as Mr. Heller has been making in the firm.

Mr. WHITLEY. He is the president?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He is the president.

Mr. WHITLEY. What are some of those investments—the nature of them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. During the 15 years of our firm's existence, I would say that Mr. Heller invested, both in stock and in loans, entered as loans due him, I should imagine, over \$110,000 or \$115,000. It averages about \$10,000 a year.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is the investment of company funds?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of his own personal funds into the company.

Mr. WHITLEY. Into the company?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. You mean that he owns half of the \$50,000 authorized capital stock, and, in addition, he has put into the company over \$100,000 of his own money?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He put in the whole of the \$50,000 of stock.

Mr. WHITLEY. He owns all of the \$50,000 of stock?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; he does not own it; he turned over to me half of it.

Mr. WHITLEY. He gave you half?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; as organizer and the one who actually runs the business.

Mr. WHITLEY. As compensation for your services?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where are those stock transactions a matter of record?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, I suppose in the minutes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have a certificate showing your \$25,000 of capital stock?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Sure.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of course.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the minutes of the organization would show the turning over to you—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of that share?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand, Mr. Heller, in addition to putting up the \$50,000, has put in, out of his own money, over \$100,000 in this business?

Mr. MASON. Over \$150,000—\$10,000 a year for 15 years.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That includes the \$50,000 in capital investment.

The CHAIRMAN. Then he has put about \$200,000 into the business?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, no. I said about \$115,000 altogether, including \$50,000 in capital investment, and about \$50,000 to \$65,000—

The CHAIRMAN. He has got nothing for that at all?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. What?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a donation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right. He has an investment and hopes to get it; but during the 15 years they have not been making any profit.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was done with the profits since the company was organized in 1924? How have the profits been divided, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. You see, they made no profits.

Mr. WHITLEY. There are no profits?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. There have never been any profits?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; there has been a loss.

Mr. WHITLEY. There has been a loss?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And Mr. Heller has, for 15 years, been making up losses out of his own pocket?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right. The losses approximate, during the whole period, about \$35,000.

Mr. STARNES. What is his business? What is his source of income from outside?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Mr. Heller is now retired, I should say the last 5 or 6 years. He is a man about 65 to 66. He was a very wealthy man, a manufacturer. He had an oxygen business for many years, which he sold later to the trust.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a member of the Communist Party, too?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He is.

Mr. MASON. He is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He is.

The CHAIRMAN. And has been a member since 1921, like you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He has been a member for 40 years of the Socialist movement.

The CHAIRMAN. For 40 years?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. For 40 years. I have been for 33 years with the Socialist movement.

The CHAIRMAN. You broke off from the radicals and joined the Communists?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right. He helped to build the Rand School, which is a Socialist educational institution.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his income the past 15 years? How long has it been, in other words, since he retired from business?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, he only retired about the last 5 years.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the name of his company?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. His company was the International Oxygen Co.

The CHAIRMAN. The International Oxygen Co.?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oxygen Co.

Mr. THOMAS. Is that company located in the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; in Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS. In Jersey?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think he sold to the United Carbide. That is right—your State, in Newark.

Mr. THOMAS. Do they also have branches abroad?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know; I don't know about his business, but I know he was connected with that. That was his firm.

Mr. THOMAS. "International" must mean some connection abroad.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have some questions, Mr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, did not Mr. Heller, through this company, the International Oxygen Co., have a concession in the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, I would not know his personal business—that particular business.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You know that, though?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; I have heard about it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do know that fact?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; that is right. And he has made plenty of money, like a lot of other concessionaires.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In the Soviet Union he has made plenty of money?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In America; he made several million dollars in America.

Mr. MASON. I did not understand what he said.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg said he had heard Mr. Heller had a concession in the Soviet Union through the International Oxygen Co.

The CHAIRMAN. And had made plenty of money?

Mr. MATTHEWS. And had made plenty of money.

Mr. THOMAS. I thought you told me you did not know that.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. What?

Mr. THOMAS. I said you told me you did not know this company had any connection abroad.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know the International's connections, but I know about this, I heard about this. I think, also in Paris, he also had a jewelry business in Paris. It is a family affair; it is a family corporation, and they had plenty of business, I think, for 30 years or more.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Trachtenberg, getting back to the financial set-up: Since the organization in 1924 of this publishing company, you say Mr. Heller has put in, in addition to his stock investment, approximately how much money to keep it going?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, I would say, as far as I remember, I think our books show that up to now the investment in the publishing house amounts to about \$115,000.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. And these are all funds put in by Mr. Heller.

Mr. WHITLEY. You say Mr. Heller is a businessman?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right; a very successful businessman.

The CHAIRMAN. He was making a lot of money in the Soviet Union at the same time, in this concession?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; it was before.

The CHAIRMAN. Before when?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Before the International Publishers was organized, as far as I remember.

The CHAIRMAN. He made money in the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; the very first years.

The CHAIRMAN. What years?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think he went there about 1918 or 1919 or 1920; something like that.

The CHAIRMAN. Up to what period was he making money in the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know whether he made money in the Soviet Union; that I don't know. I know he had a concession.

The CHAIRMAN. Over what period had he a concession?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't remember; I remember it was in the earlier years.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, how do you know he has not got it now?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He has not got it now—I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. He may have that same concession?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. I think all concessions were abolished many years ago, and there are no private concessions.

The CHAIRMAN. When? What about the International Book Store? You said that was private.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think the publishing organization was organized by residents living there in the Soviet Union—foreign-language residents.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not a Government institution?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a private institution?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right, but it is not a concession. A concession is industrialists have gone over there and began to do certain work. Mr. Heller introduced there the acetylene welding industry.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what his business is in the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't; no.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't know?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. He was a millionaire before the Russian revolution.

The CHAIRMAN. He was a millionaire before he went there?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Before there was a Russian revolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he pretty well off; is he still a millionaire?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know about that. He has not been in business.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know he was before?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, I know his contributions and investments—

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have reason to believe he is still a millionaire? [No answer.]

Mr. STARNES. To whom did he make contributions?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To educational institutions; to establish the paper The New York Call in the early years of the Socialist movement.

Mr. STARNES. What educational institutions?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The Rand School of Social Science.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you still have reason to believe he is a millionaire?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, I still believe he is, maybe, in the \$100,000 field, you know. To me it looks like millions, but I think he is a very wealthy man.

The CHAIRMAN. He is a very wealthy man?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He is a very wealthy man; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Despite the fact the International Publishers have never made any profits, and Mr. Heller has been financing and continuously financing—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. The company, since its foundation in 1924, you say its business is still being carried on because he is optimistic and believes it will turn out to be a paying concern?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, I don't think Mr. Heller expects to make any profit.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is just a kind of a hobby of his?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Precisely.

Mr. WHITLEY. He thinks he is doing something worth while?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Very important educational work.

The CHAIRMAN. He believes in the slogan, "From every man according to his ability and to every man according to his needs"?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is a very good slogan.

The CHAIRMAN. He believes in that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He does not believe in the private ownership of property?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He must.

The CHAIRMAN. He is against the capitalist class?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If he is a member of the Communist Party, he must be.

The CHAIRMAN. But not to the extent of giving up his money?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, he has given up a lot.

The CHAIRMAN. To you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; not to my organization alone, but to many organizations.

Mr. STARNES. Name some of those organizations, Mr. Trachtenberg.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I remember one was when the Call was founded. He must have put plenty of money in that paper. That was the years 1909 to 1920 on, say. That paper must have lost over a million dollars, just like the Daily Worker at the present time. And I know he was a very heavy contributor to maintain that paper.

Mr. STARNES. Does he contribute anything to maintain the Daily Worker?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know whether he is contributing now; he probably is contributing; he probably is.

Mr. STARNES. What other educational institutions or schools did he contribute to other than the Rand School?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The Rand School was the primary national educational institution of the Socialist movement at that time, very, very prominent, internationally known institution. For instance, when the building was bought for that school in 1917, he was one of the heaviest contributors to buying that building from the Y. W. C. A. for the Rand School. I remember that.

Mr. STARNES. And that school is still operated?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That school is still operated.

Mr. STARNES. But not by the Socialist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; by the Socialist Party.

Mr. STARNES. By the Socialists?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. But not actually officially, because there have been so many split-offs, but a certain part which was formerly the Socialist Party, but not by the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. I think Mr. Matthews has some questions to ask.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, you named several authors who have had their books published by the International Publishers.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Including James S. Allen?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What is James S. Allen's real name?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. His real name is Sol Auerbach.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Sol Auerbach?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes. That is his pen name; he writes under that name.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Which is his pen name?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. James Allen.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is he known anywhere as Sol Auerbach?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He is known by people who know him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you meet him, how do you address him?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As "Sol."

Mr. MATTHEWS. As "Sol"?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you published any books of James Ford?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; one book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you have published books of William Z. Foster?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right; two books.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What royalties do you pay to Mr. Ford when you publish one of his books?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, we have paid out on account of his books—

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; what percentage of royalty, please?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, no special percent.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Don't you have a book contract with authors when you publish their works?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; in the main; sometimes not. Sometimes authors pay me to publish their books.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What percent is specified as a royalty when you publish Mr. Ford's books?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is not only on the basis of percentage; it is on a lump sum as well.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We have paid now to Mr. Ford, I think, \$150. His book was only published this year, and you don't account except every 6 months. It depends on the sales of the books.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And have you paid any royalties to William Z. Foster for his publications?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; I have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And have you paid royalties to Earl Browder for his publications?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And have you paid royalties to Joseph Stalin for the books of his you have published?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The books of his we have published we have imported from England; both of his books we have published we have imported from England.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have royalties been paid on those books to Stalin?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. It is included; when you import sheets from any other publisher, all expenses are included.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever published any work of Stalin's in this country where you have not imported the sheets?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right; we published the report—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then let us not speak of "sheets" you imported, but the ones you published yourself.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you paid Stalin royalties on those?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I have not. There is no copyright agreement with the Soviet Union, and you can publish any books of any author of Russia without paying royalties.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you pay the Communist authors in this country royalties?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not all of them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Which ones have you not paid royalties in this country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We have not paid Mr. Allen, for instance. I have not paid—the amounts I have paid other authors are not very high, and the amounts we paid to Mr. Foster and Mr. Browder are also not very high.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All right, then take this question, please.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does the Soviet Union publishing concern pay Browder royalties on the books which they translate and publish in the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not know about that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, Mr. Browder stated on the stand here they did pay him royalties, and sufficient for him to live on during his trips to the Soviet Union.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, he is the recipient; he ought to know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Does the International Publishers receive any royalties from the Soviet Union on Browder's books?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None whatsoever.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then that is not the usual publishing transaction?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; not the usual publishing transaction. We sell the finished books, you see, so there is no need to pay royalties.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But when they reproduce Browder's books, they pay only Browder royalties?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right—if they have paid him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And this is a one-way transaction, is it not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. On the part of Mr. Browder?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It must be.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Browder receives royalties in Russia?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. For books of his which they publish there?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But Russian authors, publishing in this country, don't receive royalties from you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, plenty of American authors have not gotten any. You ask Lewis, and he will tell you—

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute; he is asking if Russian authors publishing in this country receive royalties.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am telling him.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question he asks. Ask the question again, Mr. Matthews.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, you have stated that you do not pay royalties to any Soviet author whose books you publish in this country; is that correct?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I said that we—

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that correct, or not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. You asked me only about one name.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am asking about all names now.

The CHAIRMAN. Ask the question over.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Ask the question intelligently, and I will answer intelligently.

The CHAIRMAN. Ask the question over.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you pay royalties to Soviet authors, including Joseph Stalin, whose books you publish in the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Most of our importations, most of the authors of Soviet origin, we don't publish originally for them; we import the sheets of all books, or the finished books. That includes—

The CHAIRMAN. He has asked you a very plain question: Do you pay such royalties?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

The CHAIRMAN. And is there any instance in which you have paid such royalties?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think there is.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, give us that instance.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Once or twice I think there is.

The CHAIRMAN. Whom did you pay it to—Stalin?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Who?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We published, away back some years ago, I think, books of two novelists to whom we paid a royalty.

The CHAIRMAN. Novels by whom?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. One novel by—his name was Ivanov; that was his name. I think that was on a basis of a royalty.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You think it was, or do you know it was?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think it was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You don't know?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't remember. It must have been many years ago, but I think there was an agent here through whom I got the translation, and I had to pay on that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then let us confine the question to officials of the Soviet Union or officials of the Comintern, such as Stalin, Dimitrov, Bukharin, and others. Have you ever paid royalties to those men?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To Dimitrov.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You paid royalties to Dimitrov?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. On what book?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. On a book called *The United Front*.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And what was the amount of those royalties?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. By this time I should imagine about \$700 or so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that remitted to Dimitrov from the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would have to look it up. I know—

Mr. MATTHEWS. What do you mean by "paying royalties"?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. You see, you pay royalties, and with reference also to when they accrue, there is on the books—I should say, according to the last auditor's report, there were royalties accruing to Dimitrov of about \$700.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Has he been paid?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not say that he has been paid.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That book was very recently published, was it not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't know whether you have paid him?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Let me explain, so you can understand, that in the publishing business you accrue the royalties and pay them sometimes once a year; that is, as the sales of the books proceed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That is every 6 months, isn't it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Sometimes 6 months, sometimes once a year. As the books are sold, you accrue each time a different percentage, say 10 percent, and then you pay—you don't pay every day on account.

The CHAIRMAN. The simple question is, Have you paid anything yet? You know whether you have or have not.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. I may owe him money.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not say "owe" it; have you paid him?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am not so sure about it; I will have to consult the books.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't know whether you have paid him or not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you know of any other instance, among such men, where you have paid royalties?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I just told you of two.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I am speaking of officials of the Comintern, or of the Soviet Union.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None other.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And the only one you think maybe you have paid is Dimitrov?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you are not sure of that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am not sure of that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you think perhaps that is simply accrued royalties?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are there any plans for paying?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Indeed so. We pay all our bills eventually.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How long ago was that book distributed?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, I should imagine, by this time, about 8 months or so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The book was published in what year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. 1938.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was published in 1938?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It does not say the year here; 1938, I imagine—yes, 1938.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you sure of that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is my recollection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It would not be 1936, would it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. 1936?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, no; no, it is a comparatively recent book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But Dimitrov's United Front—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. United Front.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was published in 1938?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is my recollection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You published it, didn't you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you consider that the most important book you ever published?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would say one of the most important books we ever published.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would not you say it represents the line of the Comintern and of the Communist Party throughout the world today?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It does.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You still think it was published in 1938?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I still think it was published in 1938.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Getting back to the question which I think was not answered very clearly, so far, you have not remitted, to your knowledge, any royalties to any officials of the Soviet Union or of the Comintern for books of theirs which you have published in this country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right. They do not do that. There is no copyright agreement, and many publishers here publish Russian books without paying any royalties, including McMillans and other firms.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But when Communist Party leaders in the United States have their books published in the Soviet Union they have paid them royalties, have they not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not necessarily.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Browder said they did.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Because numbers of authors spoke to me and asked me about it. If you will ask Upton Sinclair or Sinclair Lewis he will tell you they owe him millions of dollars, and there are other authors that the publishers never paid a cent.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not good creditors?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; not because of that; they do not have any copyright agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. They agree to pay, but do not pay?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They do not agree to pay for American publication. They publish Russian and American books, but they do not pay royalties; that is the practice in 99 percent of the cases.

The CHAIRMAN. Why would an exception be made in Mr. Browder's case if that is true?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. There have been exceptions, when some of them have gotten money.

The CHAIRMAN. But you just said that most of them never got paid.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct, but others have.

The CHAIRMAN. What others, many others?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They do not pay because they do not go there to get it, and many of those people have not gone there to get their royalties, but there are others who have collected theirs.

The CHAIRMAN. You have to go there to live to get your royalties?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It seems that way.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said you had no financial transactions with the Communist Party this year.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. With the Communist Party, as such. I did not sell them a thing.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you have any transactions with William Weiner, the financial secretary of the Communist Party, this year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, I have transactions with him; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you explain why there was a check for \$490.06 paid to you by William Weiner this year, or to the International Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It was probably for books, history books which we publish. It was money they sent to him from the book shops in various districts, and he had to turn over the money to pay for those books.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that true also of the \$234.62 paid to your firm on June 22 of this year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not be surprised.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not know what those funds were for, to a certainty?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would say it was money sent to him from the book shops.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Those are transactions amounting to approximately \$700 within the past 3 or 4 months.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right. We have sold to the workers' book shops about 40,000 books.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who pays for those, the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No: the book shop.

Mr. WHITLEY. This is coming from the financial secretary.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is just an exchange transaction. The bills were sent to the various workers' book shops in the various cities.

Mr. WHITLEY. This is an exception?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; it is.

Mr. STARNES. I want you to make clear one expression you used. You used the expression, Mr. Trachtenberg, that you had no dealings with the Communist Party, as such.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The firm has not sold any books to the Communist Party, as such, this year.

Mr. STARNES. Have you sold to individuals, leaders in the Communist Party, books for distribution?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. For distribution?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not individual persons, but to subsidiaries of the Communist Party; yes.

Mr. STARNES. That is what you meant when you said "as such"? You meant you had sold to subsidiaries, owned and controlled by the party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The book shops.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, in the New Masses of January 10, 1939, there is a statement which reads as follows:

The Communist Party have a publishing house of their own, the International Publishers, a regular book firm that have a capable output.

Is that a correct statement?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The "capable" is correct, but I doubt the ownership.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It does not speak of ownership. It says the Communist Party have a publishing house of their own.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If you will say the Communists got the books, it will be correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is this incorrect?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Incorrect, with an imputation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was this brought to your attention?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I read it; I protested.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was the protest published?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I upbraided them for it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Was that statement corrected?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not remember.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you interest yourself to know whether it was corrected?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not necessarily, there are so many misrepresentations.

The CHAIRMAN. They make so many misrepresentations that you do not keep up with them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not all of them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In speaking of your organizational connections you mentioned two or three and then stated they were all your connections.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Organizational.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are you connected with the Book Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You forgot the Book Union.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is not an organization; as a matter of fact, it was organized by myself as an exchange book-selling proposition.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is a corporation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; it is a corporation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then it is an organization, is it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not consider it a corporation; I consider it as a firm.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You mentioned the International Publishers as an organization.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; not as an organization. It is a private corporation. An organization is—

Mr. WHITLEY. I asked you about any other organizations many times, any connections you had, and you just did not remember this one.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Probably so. I mean firm; you said firm.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any other firm or connections?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; I do. I am connected with the World Tourists.

Mr. WHITLEY. Will you tell us the rest of the corporations, firms, or groups of any kind that you are connected with?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am a member of the board of directors of the International or Intercontinental News Service as an officer.

Mr. WHITLEY. What kind of a firm is that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Just a firm for the distribution of news to the newspapers.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where are the headquarters of that firm?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who are the other officers or directors of that firm?

Mr. STARNES. That is not the I. N. S., is it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is the I. N. C., the Intercontinental News Service. I think the I. N. S. is a much stronger organization.

Mr. WHITLEY. When was that news service founded and by whom?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think it was founded this year.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where was it founded?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is a corporation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is a corporation.

Mr. WHITLEY. Incorporated under the laws of the State of New York?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who are the incorporators?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Grace Maul, who is the manager, and I think the president; Mr. Sam Don, who, I believe, is the vice president; and I am the secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. They were the incorporators?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And also the directors?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Also the directors.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the purpose of that organization?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is a firm. There are only three of us. That is for the purpose of securing and the transmission of news to labor papers in this country, and particularly Latin-American countries.

The CHAIRMAN. To all labor papers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To all labor papers.

The CHAIRMAN. You make no distinction about those that are Communist and those that are not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Absolutely none; it is a service open to all.

Mr. WHITLEY. That service is furnished on a regular fee?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That service is furnished on a regular business basis.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where are the headquarters of that firm?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the address?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. 35 East Twelfth Street.

The CHAIRMAN. How many labor papers do you serve?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is a new service, but I think about 40 or so.

The CHAIRMAN. To labor papers throughout the country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. How many of those papers are in the Latin-American countries?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I imagine the proponderant majority are there.

Mr. THOMAS. The very great majority in the Latin-American countries?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right; they are much interested in American labor news.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with your firm, you named four or five people.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Three.

The CHAIRMAN. They are all members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. And the address of that news agency, 35 East Twelfth Street, is the headquarters of the Communist Party in this country; is not that true?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the charge for the service given by this concern?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not know the details of it, the financial transactions, how much they pay, or how much we pay, because we also get news from them.

Mr. WHITLEY. How much stock do you own in that concern?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not own any stock.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the authorized capital stock?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I really do not know the details.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your position in the firm?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Secretary.

Mr. WHITLEY. But it was organized just this year.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. But I was very much interested in the organization of the firm.

Mr. WHITLEY. You did not feel that the existing news agencies were sufficient, so this special agency was organized for labor papers; is that true?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is only to handle labor news.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not own any stock?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know what the charge for the service of that agency is?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It varies with the papers' circulation and ability to pay, and in many cases it is an exchange of our news with the Daily Worker, and the Federated Press exchanges our news.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say that that concern has no connection with the Communist Party? You stated that the International Publishers has no such connection?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is a private firm.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say it does not have any connection there?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just a separate corporation. Would you say this other concern has no connection with the Communist Party also?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It has this connection: It is a continuation of the Daily Worker service that used to be sent by the Daily Worker itself, now it is on a business basis.

Mr. WHITLEY. So this corporation does have connections with the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, the majority of those papers served do not pay anything for the service?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right, except personal workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The truth is you give this to the labor papers in South America and they in turn give you news?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is an exchange, you might say, on a broader basis?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. Can you name some of the papers in this country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That use this service?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I could not name all of them——

Mr. STARNES. Name some of them.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Because I was not actively connected with this work. I should imagine that the Communist papers are using it.

Mr. STARNES. Does the Federated Press get it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not be surprised.

Mr. STARNES. All the Communist papers get it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. What is the name of the labor paper published in Washington—do they get it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not know which paper is published here; I am not familiar with that.

Mr. STARNES. It is a publication called Labor; does it get that service?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not know. Miss Maul is really the manager and the sole worker. She really is the big individual.

Mr. STARNES. Does the C. I. O. News get it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not know.

The CHAIRMAN. You have quite a number in Mexico, have you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; I think in Mexico there must be two or three papers.

The CHAIRMAN. Non-Communist papers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Non-Communist papers as well.

The CHAIRMAN. In fact, most of your clientele are non-Communist papers, are they not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not think there are as many as the Communist papers.

The CHAIRMAN. But there are non-Communist papers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What size staff does the Intercontinental News Co. have to make up the news and send it out?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. One person.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does that concern or that firm receive cable dispatches from Moscow?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not that I know of.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are secretary of this new concern or firm which has just been set up. You are not by any chance just a figurehead in the set-up?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am not an active worker in the concern. My time is all occupied with the International Publishers.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not know whether they receive the Tass, the official Soviet newspaper, for dissemination?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where do they get their news? They do not have any editorial staff or any reportorial staff, do they? Do they just take the news out of the Daily Worker and transmit it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is how this firm was organized; the Daily Worker used to send it out, but this became a hardship on the Daily Worker, and they organized this subsidiary to handle this news on a business basis.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who financed it, the Daily Worker of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think the Daily Worker must have started it, because the Daily Worker is in need of this service from various countries.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is another medium through which the Communist propaganda is disseminated?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not say that; the news service is disseminated.

Mr. WHITLEY. You stated that another firm you are connected with is the World Tourists. What is your connection there?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am treasurer of that.

Mr. WHITLEY. When was the World Tourists organized in this country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. About 1926, I would say.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is it, a corporation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is a corporation.

Mr. WHITLEY. Organized under the laws of the State of New York?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who are the incorporators?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not remember who the people are that incorporated it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Were you one of the incorporators?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not think so; no, I was not, I came in later, after it was organized.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the authorized capital stock of that corporation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I really do not know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are the treasurer?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; I am the treasurer.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you do not know what the authorized stock is?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; because I came in several years after it was organized.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who are the present officers of World Tourists?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Mr. Golos is the president.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is his first name?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. J. N. Golos.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he a member of the Communist Party, too?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I cannot say; I do not know whether he is a member; I would not know.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not know?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not belong to the same fraction?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The same fraction?

The CHAIRMAN. Or branch.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He is primarily there because he is quite familiar with tourist work.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know that he is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Never saw him at any meeting?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; not at any meeting; but he may be a member of the Communist Party, but I am not sure.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would not say that he is not a member?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not say that; no.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who are the other officers at the present time, in addition to Mr. Golos?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Weiner.

Mr. WHITLEY. William Weiner?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right

Mr. WHITLEY. I do not believe Mr. Weiner mentioned that yesterday.

Mr. BRODSKY. Yes; he did.

Mr. WHITLEY. I did not recall it. Are there any other officers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I think not.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether Mr. Weiner is a member of the Communist Party or not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, yes; he is a member of the Communist Party, because he would not be entrusted with the funds of the Communist Party if he was not a member.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the nature of the World Tourists?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Tourist business throughout the world.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is an American corporation soliciting individuals to travel abroad?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Abroad and in the United States.

Mr. WHITLEY. To what countries particularly do they encourage foreign travel?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To Europe and to Latin American countries.

Mr. WHITLEY. And to Russia?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To Russia also; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you describe that as an entirely independent, private organization?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. It has no connection with the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None whatever.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is entirely separate?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Separate.

Mr. WHITLEY. No relationships there; just business relationships?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. With the same status as the International Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In that sense; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Entirely independent?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Entirely independent.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are there any other firms you belong to, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Before we leave the discussion of the World Tourists, how much money does it have? You are the treasurer. Has it got much money?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; not now, I will say.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not do any business?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It does business, but its travel is rather low now.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you do the most business, during what years?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think in the years 1927, and 1928, and 1929, up to the crisis.

The CHAIRMAN. That was your best year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; and right after that, I should imagine in the years 1931, 1932, and 1933, and lately it has dropped considerably.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the concern make good money?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; it did not make any money.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that it lost money every year it operated?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I know it did not make money.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact it lost money?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Maybe broke even.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it broke even?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not be surprised.

The CHAIRMAN. Being the treasurer, you ought not to be surprised.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I know we did not make money, I am sure about that, because very often we would borrow money.

Mr. MASON. It was not organized to make money.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It was organized to make money, and was also interested in promoting travel among workers.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, most of your business related to the Soviet Union, did it not; the books of the World Tourists show that most of the business related to the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think so; I think you are right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you say how long you have been treasurer of World Tourists?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I have been treasurer of World Tourists, I will say, about the last 8 or 10 years.

Mr. WHITLEY. About the last 8 or 10 years?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not be surprised.

Mr. WHITLEY. What business transaction does World Tourists have with the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The only business is selling tourists trips.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does it do business with the Communist Party as such, or just with individual members?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. With individual members who travel. I do not know the details of the business: Mr. Golos handles that.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do know they do not make any money?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Because I was treasurer, I know.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been treasurer about 8 or 9 years, and you are not in a position to say that the concern of which you are treasurer loses money; you do not know that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. You see, it is not a private profit-making institution, but an educational institution, and my office there as a member of the board of directors is voluntary and purely educational.

The CHAIRMAN. That has not got anything to do with the proposition. You have been treasurer for 8 or 9 years, and you cannot

tell the committee definitely whether it has lost money or they have broken even?

You are well acquainted with the affairs of the organization. Do you handle the books?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you an active treasurer or a figure-head treasurer?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I countersign the checks prepared by Mr. Golos.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know anything about the concern?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The details of it.

The CHAIRMAN. All you know is that it is an educational institution?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. An educational and travel agency to encourage workers to travel.

The CHAIRMAN. To get them to go to the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. And to go abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. To get them to go to see the workers of their homeland?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is not a bad idea.

The CHAIRMAN. If it had not been for that you would not have organized them to go to capitalist countries, would you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We would invite any member of the committee to go.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not have organized them to go to the capitalist countries?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; we would.

The CHAIRMAN. Primarily it was for the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Primarily, I would say.

Mr. STARNES. You said it was an educational institution.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In the sense of travel and the broadening of the mind.

Mr. STARNES. You merely countersigned checks drawn on the treasurer?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Golos was the man who wrote the checks and knew about the financial transactions?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. This happened to be an institution where the president was really the treasurer and the president really handled the financial transactions and the treasurer merely countersigned the checks?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He is the responsible manager of the concern.

Mr. STARNES. You were the treasurer in name only, because you only countersigned the checks?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. STARNES. The president of the corporation made out the checks.

Mr. VOORHIS. Who was Mr. Golos responsible to? Would he not have to make reports to anybody?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS. To whom?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To the board of directors.

Mr. VOORHIS. How was that composed?

Mr. TRATCHENBERG. The meeting of the board of directors consisted of three directors.

Mr. VOORHIS. But who choose the board of directors? Was it a self-appointed group? How were they selected in the first instance?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, in the first instance, I was invited to join because of the fact that I was interested, and, secondly, because I could provide, through speaking and otherwise—that is, I could get people to go on these various tours and in that way contribute.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not answer the question. The gentleman wants to know who was on the board of directors.

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes; who composed the board of directors.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Myself, Mr. Golos, and Mr. Weiner.

Mr. VOORHIS. The original impetus for the organization came from where?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. From a group, a group of people who were very anxious—primarily people who themselves traveled abroad and came back and said that workers should be organizing for travel, to carry on an educational campaign among workers in this country to visit European countries.

Mr. VOORHIS. There would not be any question that the impetus came largely from the Communist Party for this organization?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. It came primarily from individuals—

Mr. VOORHIS. From individuals who were Communists?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Who had the opportunity to travel and who came back and suggested to organize such an organization to encourage travel abroad.

Mr. VOORHIS. Did those people make contributions to the World Tourist from time to time?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If there were deficits, to cover the deficits.

Mr. VOORHIS. They did?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS. As a matter of actual fact, there was not any real effort to make money out of this, was there?

The purpose of World Tourists was not really to make money; that has really very little to do with it.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, the purpose is to make money, and if you have more travel you would make money.

Mr. VOORHIS. Let me ask you this: Suppose you had a substantial surplus in the treasury; do you not honestly believe that that surplus would be used to try to finance someone taking a trip?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not to finance somebody, but to use this money to further the educational work of this organization.

Mr. VOORHIS. I mean, such a surplus would not be distributed among the directors, or anything like that; it would be used—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To further promote travel.

Mr. VOORHIS. To promote this travel?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Trachtenberg, you stated that the World Tourists is a private organization and has no direct or indirect connections with the Communist Party. What is your salary as treasurer of the World Tourists and also as a member of the board of directors?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. At present I have no salary.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever had a salary as treasurer of the organization?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think 1 year.

Mr. WHITLEY. One year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was that salary?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, about \$30 or \$40 a week.

Mr. WHITLEY. What year was that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Probably it must have been about 2 or 3 years ago.

Mr. WHITLEY. Probably? If you received a salary, you would know it, would you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; I would know it.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you not make it more definite than probably 2 or 3 years ago?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is either 2 or 3 years ago; either 1937 or 1936.

Mr. WHITLEY. During that time did you receive a salary because you were particularly active?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Because I was particularly active and because the firm was doing a little bit better.

Mr. WHITLEY. Doing better?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right. I made an income-tax return, so that would indicate exactly when it was.

Mr. WHITLEY. As the secretary of the news agency, the Inter-Continental News Co.?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your salary as secretary of that organization?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None.

Mr. WHITLEY. No salary at all?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would not state that that was an entirely independent, private organization. You admitted that it had some affiliations or some connections with the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you also stated that the World Tourists had no business transactions with the Communist Party as such.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is my understanding; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say if they did business with officers of the Communist Party, that that would be with the Communist Party as such?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not say so.

Mr. WHITLEY. How would you describe a transaction, a business transaction with the Communist Party as such? With whom would it have to be?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It would have to be with the organization; paying for certain services, and so forth.

Mr. WHITLEY. The organization would send a check that would have to be signed, "Communist Party of the United States"?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not having any account in the name of the Communist Party of the United States, any checks would have to be signed by an official of the party, would they not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. But you make the distinction that when you have business with an official of the Communist Party it is not having business with the Communist Party as such.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If that official travels abroad and secures services, I consider that an individual transaction.

Mr. WHITLEY. The testimony with reference to Mr. William Weiner yesterday indicated that Mr. Weiner, being the financial secretary of the Communist Party and also being—what is his position with World Tourists?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think he is vice president.

Mr. WHITLEY. You think he is vice president?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. We find that on May 20, 1939, Mr. William Weiner drew a check on the Communist Party account in the Amalgamated Bank of New York payable to World Tourists in the amount of \$383.80. What was that check for, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not be able to say the exact reason for this check, but I imagine that it is either for services or—

Mr. WHITLEY. What would be the nature of the services that World Tourists could furnish the Communist Party that they would charge them \$383.80?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Possibly payment for tickets secured through the World Tourists, for travel.

Mr. WHITLEY. For travel on the part of members or officials of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Any one.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is the Communist Party in the habit of paying traveling expenses of its members and officers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes. If you travel from New York to Chicago and buy the ticket through World Tourists, they would.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of course, \$383.80 would not be for a ticket from New York to Chicago.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Maybe San Francisco and back, or maybe for a group of people traveling.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you say such a transaction constituted a business transaction with the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If they ordered the tickets, I would say yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Even though Mr. Weiner signed the check and not the Communist Party as such?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. On July 12, 1939, this year, Mr. William Weiner drew a check on the Communist Party account in the Amalgamated Bank payable to World Tourists in the amount of \$400. As treasurer of World Tourists, will you tell us what that transaction was?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Again I would not be able to tell you the exact reason for the transaction.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, you know very little about this outfit; is that right?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of course. I am not in the office, not very active.

Mr. WHITLEY. During the year that you were active, in 1937, when you think you got a salary—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. For a few months.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you find out something about the business then?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Only in a general way, when we got reports from Mr. Golos, audited reports.

Mr. WHITLEY. On June 8, 1939, this year, Mr. William Weiner drew a check payable to World Tourists in the amount of \$40.15.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is probably travel by bus for some organizer who could not afford to go by railway.

Mr. WHITLEY. Then, on July 20, this year, he drew a check to the World Tourists in the amount of \$434.12.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. What would be your explanation of that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Your guess is just as good as mine; for travel expenses, I suppose, unless it was in the form of an exchange.

Mr. WHITLEY. On August 4, this year, he drew a check payable to World Tourists, Inc., in the amount of \$1,031.83. That would probably be for travel farther than San Francisco; would you not imagine so?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would imagine that when a convention, for instance, is held, and 500 people have to travel, it would probably run up a bill, even by bus.

Mr. WHITLEY. That represents bus fare?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not be surprised.

Mr. STARNES. Was there a convention held at that time?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. What time was that?

Mr. WHITLEY. August 4, 1939.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is this year.

Mr. STARNES. Just about 30 days ago.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Probably arrangements were being made for this meeting that was held in Chicago. There was a convention held in Chicago August 29, 30, 31, and so forth, and probably arrangements were being made at that time to secure tickets.

Mr. STARNES. This is on August 4, though.

Mr. VOORHIS. You mean when they were considering the pact between Soviet Russia and Germany?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. By the way, you are in favor of that pact, are you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes, indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you at the Madison Square Garden meeting the other night when you had 20,000 people there?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. You bet.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose everybody was in favor of that pact, were they?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes, sir. You could have heard them 10 miles away.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard of a single dissenter in the Communist Party, that has denounced that pact?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I have not heard of one; no.

The CHAIRMAN. They are in absolutely unanimous agreement?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right; among the Communists and among a lot of other people as well.

The CHAIRMAN. But in the party you have never heard of a single dissenting voice?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, there was some discussion about this.

The CHAIRMAN. You all got together and decided that it was a good thing.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Individually they came to the conclusion that it was a good thing.

The CHAIRMAN. All of the 100,000 agreed that it was a good thing.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Just like you might agree about other things that are very irrelevant.

The CHAIRMAN. I say, that is what happened, is it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It just happened.

The CHAIRMAN. All of the 100,000 agreed. There was no minority on that question?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not in the Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. You do not have disagreements; you have discussions?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, we have disagreements.

Mr. STARNES. After your discussions, you all agree; is that the procedure?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We agree very often before the discussion but have a discussion to enlighten ourselves further.

The CHAIRMAN. You agree and then you meet to discuss.

Now, you think that this pact was a great help to Poland, do you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes, indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. You think they might have been cleaned up otherwise in 1 week instead of 2 or 3 weeks?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am afraid history is not made just that way.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to ask why he thinks that it was a great help to Poland.

The CHAIRMAN. He will give you an explanation.

Mr. THOMAS. What is your explanation of how this helped Poland?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Because it helped the whole world.

Mr. THOMAS. But let us get right down to Poland. How did it help Poland?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It helped Poland because of this Soviet pact with Germany at the present time.

Mr. THOMAS. But how did it help Poland? You said that it helped Poland.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It exposed the Chamberlain maneuvers and by saving Russia from war it will help Poland eventually.

Mr. THOMAS. It has not helped Poland now, then?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Neither has Mr. Chamberlain helped Poland now.

Mr. THOMAS. You admit that now it does not help Poland?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It helped Poland. It helped all the democracies in the world.

Mr. THOMAS. How did it help Poland?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. By isolating Germany against the Soviet Union. That helped Poland.

The CHAIRMAN. By isolating them?

Mr. THOMAS. How did it isolate Germany against the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Because it isolated Germany as an open, immediate enemy of the Soviet Union. A free, democratic Russia will always be a help to Poland.

Mr. THOMAS. Are not the Russians already mobilized on the Polish border?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; against Germany.

Mr. THOMAS. Against Germany?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not against Poland.

Mr. VOORHIS. There is not going to be any Poland left to be helped pretty soon.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If Russia exists there will always be a Poland.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, when you have someone you are going to fight, you isolate him from his axis or his allies; you embrace him with a nonaggression pact and in that way you help him, is that your theory?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; you do not embrace him exactly. But you isolate him for the moment so that you can yourself be prepared to finish him when he tries to kill you.

Mr. STARNES. In other words, you isolate him first; you take him in your loving embrace first—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. STARNES. And then when you get him all to yourself, you get ready to deliver the knock-out blow, is that it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Physically it is impossible to isolate and embrace at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. If the United States declared war against Russia, would you support the United States in that war against Russia?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not think the United States will declare any such war.

The CHAIRMAN. But if they did, which country would you support?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Suppose you asked me if the District of Columbia declared war against Maryland, which one would I support.

The CHAIRMAN. Which one would you support? You are a citizen of the United States, are you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been living here many years, have you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Thirty-three years.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been fairly prosperous here; you have made a good living?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had a good house to live in. And you hesitate to say which country you would favor?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not hesitate to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Which one would you favor, between Russia and the United States, if the United States declared war on Russia or Russia declared war on the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I cannot conceive the possibility of either one declaring war on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. But if they did?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Suppose I asked you the question, suppose the District of Columbia declared war against Virginia? Is that possible or not?

The CHAIRMAN. I am asking you this positive question—

Mr. THOMAS. You are just dodging the question and the reason you are dodging the question is because you know definitely in your own mind which country you would favor.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If the United States did declare war, a defensive war, I would favor the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Defensive or offensive, which country would you favor?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If Russia declared war against the United States, I would join the United States Army.

Mr. THOMAS. Suppose the United States declared an offensive war against Russia?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. An offensive war?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not believe it possible.

Mr. THOMAS. But suppose they did.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, they would not.

Mr. THOMAS. But suppose they did?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. You as a legislator should know that they would not.

Mr. THOMAS. If the United States declared an offensive war against Soviet Russia you would not take up arms in defense of the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Or against Poland; I also would not join them.

Mr. THOMAS. You are dodging the question.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I am not.

Mr. THOMAS. You would not fight for the United States, just like all the rest of you Communists.

Mr. STARNES. Let me put it this way. Where is your greatest allegiance as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As an American Communist, to the American institutions, to America.

Mr. STARNES. Is your greatest allegiance to the Communist Party and all of its ramifications? Is that where your greatest allegiance is, or is it just as a simple American citizen? Where is your greatest allegiance?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. My allegiance is to America. The Communist Party happens to be a series of beliefs which I entertain. That is not a country.

The CHAIRMAN. But if the United States were to enter into a war with Russia that you thought was indefensible, and you did not agree with it—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. You would be against that war?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would be against that war.

The CHAIRMAN. And you would be against the United States in that war?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would be against the United States entering the war.

The CHAIRMAN. But if they entered the war, your sympathies would be with Russia?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If it is an offensive war, an aggressive war, I would be opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. If it were a war you did not approve of, your sympathies and your allegiance would not be with the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Or to any other country if they had an aggressive war. I would be opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. If the United States had a war with any country that you did not think was defensible and justified, your allegiance would not be to the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would be opposed to that war and would be against it.

The CHAIRMAN. And you would do everything to handicap that war?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would do everything to get other people to join with me in the same belief.

The CHAIRMAN. You would do everything within the country to stop the war?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Within the country; that is correct.

Mr. STARNES. I want to ask a question. You said a moment ago that there were a group of people who encouraged the organization of this World Tourists, and you were very positive about that statement that that was how it started. Who are some of those people that encouraged the starting of the World Tourists?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not know the first people who started it. I was invited to come in, I should imagine, about 2 or 3 years after it was organized.

Mr. STARNES. Who were encouraging it at that time?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. At that time?

Mr. STARNES. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Myself, Mr. Golos, many people who had traveled abroad.

Mr. STARNES. I want the names of some of those people who had traveled abroad.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Mr. Golos, myself, as individuals. But there were hundreds of others who had traveled and came back and wrote us and said, "Why can't we organize an organization to promote traveling abroad?"

Mr. STARNES. Just name a few, as many as half a dozen of those hundreds, who wrote you.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The files of the World Tourists would show that.

Mr. STARNES. You certainly ought to have some sort of a memory.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Individuals.

Mr. STARNES. Individuals; that is all I am asking—that you name as many as a half dozen out of the hundreds who encouraged this idea.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I could not remember names 10 years ago, of people who favored travel; teachers, professors, other people who traveled abroad and came back and said how important it is to have workers travel; and I took it up, as I was interested all these years in educational work.

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess until 1:30.

(Whereupon a recess was taken until 1:30 p. m.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

The committee met pursuant to taking of a recess at 1:30 p. m.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order, please.

**TESTIMONY OF ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG—Resumed**

Mr. STARNES. You spoke, Mr. Trachtenberg, of the educational committee of the party and gave the name of the member who headed the committee.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is the department of education.

Mr. STARNES. Department.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The department of the party.

Mr. STARNES. Can you name some of his assistants?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I cannot.

Mr. STARNES. What?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I cannot.

Mr. STARNES. Will you tell me the duties of the education committee in the party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The eductation department of the party is to supervise the work of various schools conducted by the party, various publications which the party issues, magazines as well as pamphlets, and to outline studies and discussions in the organization.

Mr. STARNES. And do you use schools and colleges that are not owned and operated or conducted by the party as transmission belts under the eductaion department?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. STARNES. You do not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; we only work with the organization's schools.

Mr. STARNES. I see. You were at one time a member of a teachers' union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; many years ago, when I was teaching in Rand School of Social Science I was a member of the teachers' union.

Mr. STARNES. I see. You said you spent a year and one-half abroad in the early part of the twenties.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Where were you during that year and a half?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, throughout Europe.

Mr. STARNES. Where did you stay the greater part of your time?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In Russia.

Mr. STARNES. In Russia?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. What were you doing there at that time?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Visiting my brothers and sisters, whom I had not seen for 16 years before. My father had just died, and I returned to visit my family.

Mr. STARNES. Did you attend the World Congress that year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. At the end of 1922 there was a congress, and I was present.

Mr. STARNES. You were present at that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. STARNES. Did you attend any school for Leninism, or anything of that nature?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. STARNES. Did you have any contact with the party leaders at that time in Russia?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. STARNES. You did not have, either officially or unofficially, any relations with any of the officials of the Soviet Government?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. With the trade-unions; I was collecting material for a book on the Russian labor movement and was visiting trade-unions and getting materials; that is, reports and similar materials that I was to use in connection with that.

Mr. STARNES. How about the Comintern; have you had any connection with it while you were there?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. STARNES. That is all.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Trachtenberg.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. During the period May 20, 1939, to August 4, 1939, a period of a little over 2 months, William Weiner, the treasurer of the Communist Party of the United States, made out checks to the World Tourists of \$2,289.90. I gave you the individual amounts this morning, and your explanation of those payments was that it was for bus travel; I believe that was your explanation.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I said it may be.

Mr. WHITLEY. May be bus travel?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now what commission does the World Tourists charge the party when it arranges bus travel for them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No commission; they just act—the tourists pay the regular charges.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is it not true that they get a commission for the business?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The World Tourists gets a commission from railroads, or from busses on the business, naturally; that is, to pay their overhead.

Mr. WHITLEY. And although this period covered by this account under examination is only for a little over 2 months, is that rather typical of payments that are made from Mr. Weiner to the Communist Party to World Tourists; that is, the amount of \$1,000 a month, for this period, would you say that is approximately the volume between the World Tourists and the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not necessarily.

Mr. WHITLEY. Not necessarily?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It would come in spurts; when there was a big season, naturally, when there were a lot of people traveling; and at other times the business may not be as large throughout the year, and times when they purchased tickets from the World Tourists.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Now we were on the matter of the source of income for the International Publishers.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you stated your principal source of income was from the sale of books published?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was there any other source of income for the International Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I stated such investment and contributions which Mr. Heller made.

Mr. WHITLEY. To make up the deficits that occurred over the period of year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is there any other source that you have not named?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As far as the income of the International Publishers?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. That was the only source of income of the International Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the total annual budget on which the International Publishers operate, approximately, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It has no budget.

Mr. WHITLEY. No budget?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. And what is the total annual income?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Business?

Mr. WHITLEY. From sales?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. From sales?

Mr. WHITLEY. From sales of books?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would say—I haven't got the exact figures before me, but I would estimate between \$75,000 and \$80,000 a year, the amount of business actually done in sales, gross sales.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is gross sales?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And how is that money spent, that income of \$75,000 to \$80,000 a year?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is spent in the production; the main portion of it is spent in the production of books; that is, the purchase of paper and printing and binding and things of that sort.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have a very small pay roll?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. About five or six employees?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is really only four at the present time.

Mr. WHITLEY. Four employees?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. So that the income is spent for current operating expenses in publishing books, of the business?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; in the production, promotion, advertising, sales, commissions, taxes, and the usual line of expenses.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you do a great deal of advertising?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not a great deal.

Mr. WHITLEY. What publications do you advertise in principally?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Various trade publications; Publisher's Weekly, principally, which is a trade publication.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you not advertise in the Daily Worker?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not advertise in the Daily Worker?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; we expect free service, free publicity.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is usual?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is not advertising.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, you do not have to pay for that.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that true in all Communist publications?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is also true of the New York Times; we do not advertise; we expect publicity in the form of reviews.

Mr. WHITLEY. Through reviews?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. The New York Times and the Daily Worker review your publications?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. All the papers usually will have a review of serious books.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are all of the financial transactions for the International Publishers handled through banking institutions?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And where are your banking accounts maintained?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In the Amalgamated Bank, or the Chase National, the Madison Square branch. The Amalgamated, because we were originally at Fifth Avenue, and that was nearest to us.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. And we continued the account there; and also in my neighborhood in the Madison Square branch.

Mr. WHITLEY. Those are the two banking institutions?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are all financial transactions handled through banks?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words you do not do business on a cash basis?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Are all your financial transactions recorded in books and records?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. And in what name are the banking accounts maintained?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. International Publishers Co., Inc.

Mr. WHITLEY. It is not done in your individual name?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have as an organization any affiliated, subsidiary, or allied group organizations?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Of any kind?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None connected with the International Publishers or subsidiaries.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who are members of the organization or with whom you do cooperate?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. With the exception of publishing or selling organizations with whom we have business relations, buying and selling connections.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Now, Mr. Trachtenberg, this morning you identified and described a number of trips which you have taken to Russia since, I believe, 1929.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not only Russia: to Europe.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you ever go to Europe without going to Russia?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I said go to Europe, including Russia.

Mr. WHITLEY. Including Russia.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Both to Russia and England, the main sources from which come our imports of books.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who pays, or paid, your expenses on those trips?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The International Publishers.

Mr. WHITLEY. The International Publishers paid them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Business expenses?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Business trips.

Mr. WHITLEY. They paid all of your expenses on those trips?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Trachtenberg, I believe you stated this morning that you did not presently have and never have had any relationship of any kind with the Amtorg Trading Corporation, the official Soviet Trading Corporation in this country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I did not ever work there.

Mr. WHITLEY. You never worked there; did you ever have any official relations with it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Away back in the twenties—I don't remember whether it was in 1925 or 1926, I acted as a consultant in the publication of a book or a catalog of American firms.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Merely in a business capacity.

Mr. WHITLEY. Just a business relation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. A business relation.

Mr. WHITLEY. And because they wanted to put out a book and you were bidding, or going to bid?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I did not publish it for them, but I was associated with the editorial committee.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In an advisory capacity.

Mr. WHITLEY. You had no other?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No other connection.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever occupied any position or were you ever given any authority of any kind in connection with the Amtorg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None whatsoever.

Mr. WHITLEY. None whatever?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are positive about that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am positive.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever had any connection or relationship with the Soviet's OGPU?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None.

Mr. WHITLEY. None whatever?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. None whatever.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you never got out a report of that organization?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You know of it, of course?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is from hearsay?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Have you ever known Juliet Stuart Poyntz?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. When did you know her?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. She went to the Rand School as a teacher, in the years when she was assistant professor, in 1915 or 1916.

Mr. WHITLEY. 1915 or 1916?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That was when I was also a teacher in the Rand School.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you seen her since then?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I have seen her off and on.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is she a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, or was she when you were a member?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Never.

Mr. WHITLEY. She was not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Never; never was a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party while I have been.

Mr. WHITLEY. You know that she was an active party member for many years, do you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. For some years.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you read the Daily Worker?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you saw her name appearing very frequently in the Daily Worker over a period of years, did you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That would not make her a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did she ever go to Moscow?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know whether she was ever a delegate or not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I never heard of it.

Mr. WHITLEY. You never heard about it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I never heard of it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Would you class her as a rank-and-file member?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Probably. I would not know if she went as a delegate to any official parties; I would not know about it; I never heard about it.

Mr. WHITLEY. If she were a member of the national committee you would know?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As a member of the national committee; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, what was the last time you saw or had any connection with Juliet Stuart Poyntz?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, probably since 10 years ago.

Mr. WHITLEY. About 10 years ago?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And do you know how long she has been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not even know when she joined.

Mr. WHITLEY. You know of the fact that the New York papers frequently carried her name in the early years?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I saw that—

Mr. WHITLEY (continuing). As leading demonstrations for the Communist Party; in connection with her arrest?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; I saw that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, if a person's name appeared in a manifesto published in the Daily Worker along with the names of Maxim Gorky, Clarence Zetkin—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG (interposing). Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And, say, six or seven others of like caliber, would you say that person is a leading member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They may not even be a member; it depends upon the kind of manifesto; most of the Communist Party manifestoes are cultural.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I said if a person who is a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And whose name appears on such a list as I have described.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. In an International manifesto published in the Daily Worker, would that constitute that person a member—a leading member?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. What was the manifesto; what kind of a manifesto?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Never mind that.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, it is important; if the manifesto is publishing some kind of a cultural issue and she was to have been quite well known, especially here in the United States, why she would—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). The question was if she were a member of the Communist Party. The question deals with the Communist Party, Mr. Trachtenberg.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; and I do not know what the manifesto is.

The CHAIRMAN. If she is a Communist and her name appears along with the two others whom she named and six or seven others, would that constitute or indicate that she was a leading Communist?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Gorky was not; he was a writer.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we are talking about this person.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. A manifesto of Maxim Gorky; he may sign manifestoes on a cultural question.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would you classify Zetkin as a leading Communist?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As a Communist?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; would you say he was an outstanding Communist?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. So was Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, and William Liebknecht.

The CHAIRMAN. How many years had you been in this movement?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Thirty-three years.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever during that time been in disagreement with the Comintern on a policy matter?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, you see, I was 2 years—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I mean since you have been a member of the Communist Party, have you ever disagreed with the Comintern?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, I do not believe so.

The CHAIRMAN. You have agreed with them 100 percent all during that time?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, I have agreed, whether 100 percent I would not say, but I agreed; that is why I joined the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. You have agreed with them more than the average man agrees with his wife?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; as it happens, although you might think it odd of a Communist, I have been married to the same person for 22½ years.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you agreed with your wife 100 percent?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, we are still married after 22½ years; you may not think that possible of a Communist.

Mr. WHITLEY. Getting back to Juliet Stuart Payntz, Mr. Trachtenberg.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have not had any contact or knowledge of her, personal knowledge, for the past 10 years?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would say real personal contact with her; I have not known her since 1915 or 1916, when she was at the Rand School for Social Science.

Mr. WHITLEY. You were active in the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And she was, too?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, you see, when you are active in the national organization, when I was on the national committee, I did not know very many in New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. You did not know very many members in the rank and file?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I did not say that; I know a great many members, but I do not know the New York members so well.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you not, up to about 1934, know that she was continuously active in the party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know; I do not even know when she joined the party.

Mr. WHITLEY. I am talking about the time around approximately 1934; she apparently dropped out of the Communist Party actively in New York?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have not heard of her?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I have not heard of her, except what I saw in the papers, in reference to the time when her name appeared in the press.

Mr. WHITLEY. Except what you saw in the papers when, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. A few years ago.

Mr. WHITLEY. 1937, was it not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Probably 1937.

Mr. WHITLEY. That she had disappeared?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. And reference to her.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you have not heard or seen her since?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is all I know about it.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you ever discuss that with any party members?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. And you are not able to tell what happened to her?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, you know that she was active on the Communist ticket in the State of New York?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think she was.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You would not call as a rank-and-file member a person who was running for lieutenant governor, would you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. On the Communist ticket?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, a miner may run for Governor or even the United States Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Your party is a very democratic organization, is it not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Very much so; I think it is the most democratic organization in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they had elections in Russia?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I should say so.

The CHAIRMAN. You had an election not so long ago?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Who opposed Stalin's election in the last campaign?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not think he had any opposition; I do not think he had an opponent.

The CHAIRMAN. What would have happened to his opponent if he had?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He would have gotten very few votes against Stalin; he would not get more than a few.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Whitley.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Trachtenberg, has the International Publishers Co. ever registered with the State Department as an agent of a foreign principal?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. It has not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever considered that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. Never considered registering as such?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. I understand from your explanation as to your relationship with private publishing concerns, or book shops, or book-agency concerns in Soviet Russia, the International Bookshop it is called.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That you put in orders to them for the printing of books on Soviet origin?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not to them; to the Cooperative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The orders are to them.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. But shipments go to the International Bookshop.

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It keeps a line on the exports.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, they must go through the International Bookshop?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right; it handles the exports.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is in accordance with an explanation previously made.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is your understanding?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You are able to order these books, printed in Russia, and have them shipped over here?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. They send them over on the American market. It is cheaper to do that than it is to print them in this country. What is the reason for that; is it the difference in the wage scale paid printers in this country, under the labor-union wage scale paid printers here?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; as I explained before, that it is cheaper for the American publishers to import from England or from Russia or from China—I have imported some books from Shanghai printed in English.

Mr. WHITLEY. What book was that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That was a study on the agrarian problems in China, put out by a Chinese professor, and published in Shanghai.

Mr. WHITLEY. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not a member of the Communist Party.

When there is a small edition, one which is not important, a small edition; when the edition will not run, say, over 500 or 1,000 books, it does not pay to print them here.

Mr. WHITLEY. Why do you not print the book over here and then sell as many as you can, and you might in that way be able to sell them abroad?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. When we have a publication, to be put out in such quantities, within a certain period that will justify it, it is cheaper to publish them here, and we do. As I indicated, when we are able to publish as many as 3,000 copies. But, at the same time, it is cheaper to buy them when you only require a small quantity.

Mr. WHITLEY. Why do you not publish them in this country and furnish the publications to others?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We do.

Mr. WHITLEY. You do?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. For instance, to the English publishers. It is a question of whether the capital involved justifies it. That is why we have about 15 or 16 connections with publishers in England with whom we do business, from whom we buy, and who buy from us. The same thing is true here. MacMillan Co. and other publishing houses do the same thing.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the relation, Mr. Trachtenberg—I believe you have already stated your relation with the Compro Daily—what is the relationship between that and the Daily Worker publication?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The Compro Daily has no connection.

Mr. WHITLEY. None whatever?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. WHITLEY. What about the literary department; is it synonymous with the Workers Library Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; it is not synonymous; the literary department consists of individuals.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the relationship of the International Publishers with the literary department of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It has no relationship with the International Publishers; the literary department, under the Library Publishers, is the concern which buys books from us for distribution.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the relationship between the International Publishers and the Morning Freedom, the publishing company?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I believe when it buys books it is permitted—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). In other words, it buys books from you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. A business relationship?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. A business relationship.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you loaned them money or credit?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Sometimes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have extended liberal credit terms to them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. You mean by that—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). Very liberal terms?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not so liberal; the usual terms.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the New World Book Shop?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The New World Book Shop?

Mr. WHITLEY. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. What city?

Mr. WHITLEY. What is your relationship to it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. What city is that? There are many book shops that have many different names.

Mr. WHITLEY. We will get back to that in a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any relationship at all with any book shop called the New World Book Shop?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not have my accounts here; sometimes we have an account, and we may have an account called the New World Book Shop. I do not know offhand that name.

Mr. WHITLEY. Your most important publication, for instance, is the History of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is not important; I publish that same publication—

Mr. WHITLEY (interposing). But you said the first edition was 100,000 copies.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. WHITLEY. Did you sell this directly to book stores of the Communist Party, or do you sell it to the district organizations and they in turn distribute it through other organizations?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I said that we sell them to the districts, to the book shops in the various districts.

Mr. WHITLEY. In other words, not to the district organization itself?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not to the district organization itself; the book shop. As I said, we deal with the organizations, but that the districts may run book shops, but we will sell to the book shops.

Mr. WHITLEY. How many Communist Party book shops or book stores are there in the United States?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would say that there are organized book shops, or places that are owned by the districts, privately owned but are operated for the districts. I should imagine, between 40 and 50.

Mr. WHITLEY. Forty and fifty?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Something like that.

Mr. WHITLEY. Scattered throughout the country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. From the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the relationship between the International Publishers, that is business or otherwise, and the Weekly Masses?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The Weekly Masses also purchases books from us. They sell, buy a number of certain books and also have subscription campaigns, use premiums.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have already described your relationship with the Workers' Library Publishers, I believe.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. And how about your relationship and activities with the Wholesale Book Corporation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of New York?

Mr. WHITLEY. It is the literature department of the State organization.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; our dealings with the literature department in New York, New York State, where these books, general publications comprise about 50 percent of the sales; about 50 percent of the sales in America are in New York.

Mr. WHITLEY. What is the relationship of the International Publishers with the Labor Research Association, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The Labor Research Association; very often they will prepare manuscript, studies, on various economic and labor questions, and are very anxious to have them published and distributed, and we will publish some of them.

Mr. WHITLEY. You publish some of them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. Who is the head of that research association?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Mr. Robert W. Dunn.

Mr. WHITLEY. How long has he been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. To my knowledge he has never been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. I see. Are you connected with the Labor Research Association in any way?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Just in an advisory capacity after the organization in America of the first Labor Research Association, and that was while I was connected with the Rand School of Social Science.

Mr. WHITLEY. You have no official connection with that association?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I have no official connection with them.

Mr. WHITLEY. Have you ever had any official connection with the Labor Research Association?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No, sir: just advisory—because we publish some of their books, too.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is that a corporation or just a private association?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't think it is a corporation. I think it is merely a private association.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you know who the officers are?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not know who the officers are.

Mr. WHITLEY. Where is their headquarters in New York?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Their headquarters are 799 Broadway; and the people who work there, Mr. Dunn, Miss Anna Rochester, Miss Grace Hutchins—those are the important persons.

Mr. WHITLEY. When was that association organized?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I believe about 10 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Are any of those persons Communists, whose names you just called?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Miss Hutchins, I think, is a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the others?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Miss Rochester, I am not so sure.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not be surprised, though?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I would not. She is quite a good student of communism, and a very good Marxist. She comes of a very good family.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is she the head of the economic department of the New York Public Library?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; she is not. She does not have to work for a living. She has an income.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, she is rich, too? You have a lot of rich people in the party, haven't you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I guess there are some; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, that question that Mr. Matthews just asked, I think, should be further developed. Are you sure that she is not connected with the New York Public Library?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am sure. I know she has not worked for a living for many years.

Mr. THOMAS. But are you sure that she is not connected with the New York Public Library at the present time?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Except in the capacity of a research student who studies there. She writes books.

Mr. THOMAS. That is what she is doing; just studying there?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is my understanding. She is not working for a living, and never has worked for a living.

Mr. THOMAS. Never mind that. She may be working there for the public library, but not working for a living.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I know she is not working there. She is just working for herself, as a student.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You can testify that she is not a member of the staff of the New York Public Library?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Under oath.

Mr. THOMAS. Remember you are testifying under oath.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Right, Mr. Thomas, under oath.

The CHAIRMAN. That oath business would not make any difference: you would tell the truth just the same if you were not under oath?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of course. But I know that to be true. Anna Rochester has been working there for years as a student. She has collected information, and she has worked for about 5 years to prepare books which I published, called Finance, Capital in the United States, and Rulers of America.

Mr. CASEY. Is that how she made her money?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, no; she lives on an independent income from her family.

Mr. CASEY. You do have millionaires in the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, I haven't taken a census, but I know there are some people who can afford to live on their income and not work for a living.

Mr. CASEY. You would not say "scratch a Communist and you find a capitalist," would you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, no; but I would not be surprised to find some. There are quite a number of people in business who are members of the Communist Party. Why not? It is open to everybody.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Trachtenberg, will you contact the New York

Public Library and find out just what this young woman's status is with them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. What is her full name?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Anna Rochester. She was for many years a missionary in China, and later came back here.

The CHAIRMAN. Is she a very religious woman?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. She must have been. She was a missionary.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is the Labor Research Association a private, independent, nonpartisan group?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is it a commercial project? Does it sell service?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They do sell service to labor unions and others.

Mr. WHITLEY. You consult with them. Do you get any salary or payments?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, no. I just consult them about their studies and help them distribute some of their studies.

Mr. WHITLEY. And is it a commercial enterprise?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, I would not put it just on that basis. It is more a social-service enterprise. These people got together for the purpose of studying labor conditions and providing service to labor unions on various questions; for instance, on its investigation of wage conditions they prepared facts about employers, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they furnish that service to a number of organizations?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; to whoever writes for it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not confined to Communist organizations?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, no; it is all over the country. Individuals and organizations may ask them for information.

The CHAIRMAN. It is just a service set-up? The Communist Party does not have anything to do with it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. So far as I know, nothing whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. You would know, being on the national committee?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would know.

The CHAIRMAN. It just happens to be Communist run?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, no. Mr. Dunn is not a Communist, and has not been from the very beginning. I know definitely that he is not a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. You know that he is sympathetic to the Marxian theory, do you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If you will read some of his writings and some of the books he has published, I think you will see that he is a Marxist, but he is not a member of the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. He is a Marxist, but not formally a member of the party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He is not a member.

The CHAIRMAN. You have some people who belong to the party but are not Marxists?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, there are people who are joiners. There are lots of them. Then there are people who personally do not belong, but who are Marxists. There are a lot of Republicans who do not belong to the Republican Party.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Trachtenberg, does the Communist Party utilize the services of the Labor Research Association very often for statistics?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. From time to time, I would not be surprised if they do.

Mr. WHITLEY. Does your organization, International Publishers, utilize their statistics?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We don't need them. We don't buy anything from them.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you have any financial transactions with them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Labor Research? Only such as when they have bought our books.

Mr. WHITLEY. Now, you not only publish but you sell direct as a retailer, do you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, yes; of course. We sell to individuals as well.

Mr. WHITLEY. You sell as a wholesaler, a jobber, and also to individuals?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, yes. We get mail orders; individuals come to us and buy books, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. How many books and pamphlets do you sell every year, approximately?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That would be hard to estimate. Say \$80,000 worth of business, gross; and as far as books are concerned, our books are \$3, \$2.50, and \$2; and figuring that you average about a dollar and a half a book, that will give you an idea. Ninety percent of our publications are books, and 10 percent would be pamphlets.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you ever distribute anything free?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not give anybody anything for nothing?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. Even some of my friends have to pay for their books.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean even these histories and pamphlets on Marxism and the Communist Party; none of them are given away?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. You make them pay for them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of course, naturally.

Mr. WHITLEY. You sell your books and pamphlets to schools, universities, and other educational institutions?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, yes: we have quite a library trade—universities, public libraries, and schools. Our books are used as collateral reading in various courses, such as economics, politics, history, and so forth.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many copies of the Reports of the Seventh World Congress of 1935 did you distribute?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I did not publish that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not speaking of you as connected with International Publishers, but as the head of the literature commission of the Communist Party.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not know that. Mr. Douglas, who is in charge of the Library Publishers, who published it, could tell you.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Could you not estimate it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not be able to estimate it. I would say that Mr. Douglas could supply that information.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You once made a speech in which you stated exactly how many you had distributed. Have you forgotten that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Where did I make that speech?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You reported to the June plenum session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party on its literature work. How many copies of the Seventh World Congress did you state in that report you had distributed?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know whether I made a report in that particular plenum.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me refresh your memory. [Handing a pamphlet to the witness.] Is that your report?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No, sir. It says, "Reports of the Seventh World Congress."

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that is not yours?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is 1937.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that is not yours?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right; that is part of a speech which was made.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Made by whom?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, it looks like my language.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What about the speech itself, though?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It was yours?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And how many did you state you distributed?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I distributed it for the literature committee.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many does it state there?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It says, "Distributed 500,000 copies of the Reports of the Seventh World Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. That is true if you said it, is it not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It must be. I wish it was 5,000,000.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you make regular reports to the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; not regularly; only when I am participating in speaking; not always.

Mr. MATTHEWS. How many copies of the Foundations of Leninism, by Stalin, have you distributed?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. About—the last was published 5 years ago; in the last 5 years, about a hundred thousand copies.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have not brought out that additional quarter of a million that you speak of in this speech?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not yet. I was hoping 2 years ago to have succeeded. I haven't had money enough for it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And how many copies of Left Wing Communism, by Lenin, have you distributed?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We published that. We must have distributed—oh, I should say by this time probably two editions; about 10,000 or so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then this figure of a hundred thousand is considerably exaggerated; is that correct?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; it was also an attempt to publish a hundred thousand at 10 cents; and we were not successful in getting that through.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you did distribute half a million copies of the Reports of the Seventh World Congress?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; it was published by the Library Publishers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, you accept the reports and the theses and the decisions of the Seventh World Congress, do you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As a member of the Communist Party, I certainly do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever personally spoken or written of the Soviet Union as the workers' fatherland?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I might have expressed it in that poetic language.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Aren't you sure that you have done so?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes. I write quite a lot. It is a poetic expression.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a fantasy, in other words?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, no; I would not call it a fantasy. Poetry and fantasy are different things.

The CHAIRMAN. But poetry does allow certain license?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Especially in the use of words.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In speaking of the defense of the Soviet Union, is that also poetic?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, no; that is not poetic.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then you mix prose and poetry sometimes?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Sure I do.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you said in a pamphlet: "They"—referring to the workers of the United States—"must defend the Soviet Union, the workers' fatherland," you were mixing poetry and prose, were you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That was my pamphlet?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I will ask you to identify it.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right; I might as well identify my own writing.

(The paper referred to was handed to the witness).

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right: this is Eugene Debs. I wrote about Debs—an old friend of mine, and a great American; the greatest America has ever had, perhaps.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, you also had an old friend by the name of Bukharin, did you not?

The CHAIRMAN. You say that Debs was one of the greatest Americans we have ever had?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes, sir: one of the greatest we have ever had.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean the type of American you admire?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He is a Hoosier; the greatest America ever produced.

Mr. WHITLEY. Is he greater than Earl Browder?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We do not measure that way. Debs was a leader before Browder was born.

Mr. VOORHIS. Do you think he would be a member of the Communist Party if he were alive?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think so.

Mr. MATTHEWS. He was alive 5 years after the Communist Party was founded, and never joined the Communist Party.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I explained that.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But was he not alive 5 years after the Communist Party was founded?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But if he had lived 20 more years, he would have joined, in your opinion?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I dare say he would have joined.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You once had a friend named Bukharin, did you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know what you mean by "friend."

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have published his books, have you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am speaking of you as representing International Publishers. You have published several books by Bukharin, have you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you state what you do with an edition of books when the author is purged by the Soviet Union? You must have faced that problem also, as a publisher. You had Bukharin's books on hand at that time, did you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I had.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Bukharin was shot last year, was he not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I so understand by the papers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just by the papers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you publish a book in which you stated that he was shot?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Did I publish a book? I don't think I had occasion to publish a book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did not the party publish a book on the so-called Trotskyite trials?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So you learned it there as well as from the papers, did you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So you have no doubt about it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, will you please tell us just how you disposed of Bukharin's books when he was purged.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I still have them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. At 381 Fourth Avenue?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. At 381 Fourth Avenue.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not keep them on the shelves do you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. You see, I haven't a book store. I have them in my stockroom, of course, where all the books are kept.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are they advertised in your catalog? Are they listed in your current catalog?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They are listed in my catalog on the active list, and they may be in this catalog.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I do not think they are.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. You looked at it, did you?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are they on the shelves of your book stores throughout the country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I do not own any book stores.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The Communist Party does. Do you have any orders from Communist members now?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If we get orders, we fill them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But do you get orders?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I say, if we get orders, we fill them. If we do not get orders, we do not fill them.

The CHAIRMAN. But he asked you if you had orders for this book.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is what I say, if we get orders, we fill them. The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any orders now?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. At this time? No; I don't think his books are in demand.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, to be absolutely frank, when he was purged, the party repudiated him all over the United States; is not that a fact?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No: as a matter of fact some of his books were criticized and repudiated several years before he was tried.

The CHAIRMAN. But I mean, since his untimely or timely death, whatever it may be, there has been no demand for any of his books, has there?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; there has not been.

The CHAIRMAN. There was a demand for them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. There was a demand 12 or 13 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. There was a demand when you published them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no longer any demand?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. There is no longer any demand to speak of.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, you have not had even one person ask for a single book since then?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, I would not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you say?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would say there were a number of people who asked for these books. They may not have been Communists. They may have been Trotskyites, you know.

Mr. VOORHIS. Are you not quite certain they would not have been Communists if they had come to you and ask for a copy of that book?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I would not say so; because I could imagine that the workers' schools of the party would want these books, to refute them.

The CHAIRMAN. The only purpose for which they would want them would be to refute them. As a matter of fact, a Communist would not want to read them, would he?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Why not? If he is intelligent, he would want to read them.

The CHAIRMAN. But a good Communist would not approve of this man?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of him? But he would want to read his books, to know his ideas, in order to combat them.

The CHAIRMAN. But a good Communist would not approve of this man? That is the question I am asking.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They do not approve of him because of his wrong policies.

The CHAIRMAN. He was wrong?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He was wrong.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Why did you publish his books if they needed to be refuted? You did not know they would be refuted at that time, did you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We did not publish his books because of that. The books were being criticized during the time and after they were published.

Mr. WHITLEY. What was his position in the Communist Party when you published his books?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He was at that time the editor of the Pravda—a very high position.

Mr. STARNES. That is the official publication of the Soviet Government, is it not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; it is not of the government. It is an official publication of the Communist Party.

Mr. STARNES. The Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Of the Soviet Union; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Matthews is asking some very pertinent questions, and I make the suggestion that we try to allow Mr. Matthews to complete all his questions without interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a good suggestion.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, these books are printed and bound, as a rule, by the Van Rees Press, are they not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The Van Rees Press.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When you order an edition of five or ten thousand copies of a book from this concern, do you take delivery of the entire edition?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; it is not done that way.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You do not do it that way?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No. No publisher does it that way.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You take a part of the edition?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right. The book is published, and the bindery keeps your stock for you for a number of years, and you draw as you need them. They make deliveries every day.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am talking about how you conduct your business with the Van Rees Press.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is how we conduct our business with the Van Rees Press. I simply call for books as I have orders to fill.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What are the terms of settlement? Do you pay for books that you take delivery on?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I should say so; yes, of course.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you pay for them only as you take delivery of them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. So that the several thousand copies that are left with the Van Rees company constitute one of their liabilities, not one of yours?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Well, not all of it. For the printing part of it, the press work, and the composition, they usually have about 90 days' credit. Sometimes it has to be thrashed out longer, when there is no money available to pay, and they issue notes, and so on. The binding part also comes in; you also get 90 days credit, but you pay for what you draw. Then at the end of the year you get from them a bill for undelivered books, and very often, for as far back as 3 years, they would let you have books for which you do not pay, as far as the binding is concerned. But after that you have to pay, whether you sold them or not. You have to pay for all

the stock. So I have there now a lot of stock that is paid for, but not as yet withdrawn.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is there any stock of books by authors who have been purged by the Soviet Union now in the hands of the Van Rees Press?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is stock there?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you paid for it in full?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If they were published, say in the last 3 years, I have paid for them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you have any stock there by these men who have been purged that has not been paid for?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. What names?

Mr. MATTHEWS. You must know.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I mean, what authors?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I have not a complete list of those who have been purged. That is reported to constitute many thousands, so I cannot tell you.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They are not all writers, you know.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A great many writers have been purged also. You published Trotsky's books, did you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You published books by Radek?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You published books by Zinoviev?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You did not publish a book by Zinoviev on the World War?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are sure of that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am quite sure of that. I did not know there was such a book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All right. Returning to the question—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG (interposing). So the only one is really Bukharin.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And there is a stock of Bukharin's books with the Van Rees Press that you have not taken delivery on?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Do you expect to take delivery of those books?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If there is a demand for them. There are a lot of books there that I haven't sold a copy of for the last 10 years. People don't want them.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, you said that you were the founder or organizer of the Book Union; which was it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; I was one of those who were interested in founding this Book Union.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Were you interested in it, or did you found it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I was one of the founders.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And the headquarters of the Book Union is 381 Fourth Avenue?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The same address as International Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Are the following persons on the editorial board of the Book Union : Malcolm Cowley?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Robert W. Dunn?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Henry Hart?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Granville Hicks?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Corliss Lamont?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Isidor Schneider, of the New Masses?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. He used to be.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Isn't he with the New Masses now?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not so far as I know. I have not seen his writings.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Bernard Smith?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yourself?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And Mary Van Kleeck, of the Russell Sage Foundation?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And do these persons constitute the advisory council? I will read the whole list:

Heywood Broun, Sterling Brown, Erskine Caldwell, Kenneth Burke, Jack Conroy, Addison T. Cutler, H. W. L. Dana, R. Palme Dutt, Joseph Freeman, Leo Gallagher, Ben Gold, Michael Gold, Horace Gregory, Quincy Howe, B. W. Huebsch, Langston Hughes, Matthew Josephson, John Howard Lawson, Robert Morss Lovett, Lewis Mumford, Clifford Odets, Frank Palmer, Bernhard J. Stern, Maxwell S. Stewart, John Strachey, Genevieve Taggard, Ernst Toller (now deceased), Carl Van Doren, Harold Ward, Louis Weinstock, and James Waterman Wise?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right. That is a pretty good list.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you published any pamphlets or books by Bernhard J. Stern?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I have not. Oh, pamphlets? Yes, I have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Under what name does Bernhard J. Stern teach at the Workers' School?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know that he is teaching in the Workers' School. I have never heard of him teaching in the Workers' School.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you ever published a pamphlet by a man called Bennett Stevens?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Bennett Stevens? Yes; that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And also by Bernhard Stern? You stated a while ago that you had published pamphlets by Bernhard Stern.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Edited; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you do not know that Bernhard Stern and Bennett Stevens are the same person?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. What is the name of the pamphlet? It must be many years ago.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you met both Bernhard Stern and Bennett Stevens?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, there are many authors who write under pseudonyms.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you met Bernhard Stern, whose pamphlets you have published?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And have you met Bennett Stevens?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; that is the pen name of Bernhard Stern. That is correct. That must have been about 12 years ago that I published those. I have no record before me. You have all the records there, you see.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you know that Bernhard Stern is a professor at Columbia University, do you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think he is teaching there; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, Mr. Trachtenberg, you are the chairman of the literature commission of the Communist Party, are you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And you are familiar with the arrangements made for the distribution of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, are you not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You are familiar with the mimeographed statement that went out concerning the distribution of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; that is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you please identify this as the special bulletin issued by the Org-Educational and Literature Commissions? [Handing a paper to the witness.]

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I ask that this be marked as an exhibit.

(The paper referred to was marked "Trachtenberg Exhibit No. —, September 13, 1939," and is filed herewith.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, as a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, you are familiar with the resolution adopted by the national committee on the distribution of the history?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. That resolution states as follows:

We accept full responsibility for the sale of 100,000 copies of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and will use this, together with the whole campaign connected with the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the Communist International and our own party, as a means of raising the ideological level of our entire party membership.

That resolution is stated to have been adopted in December 1938. That is a direct quotation from the resolution?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, in this document which you have identified it is stated:

The national committee will absorb the cost of distribution to the districts.

Is that a correct statement?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I think so; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Weiner, on the stand yesterday, categorically denied, under repeated questioning, that there was any direct or indirect subsidy of any kind by the national committee to the districts.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. There has been no subsidy by the national committee to the districts.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, whether we call this a subsidy or something else, it falls in the same category, does it not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; but I can testify here and say that the International Publishers have paid the cost of the shipment of the books to the various parts of the country.

Mr. MATTHEWS. When it says here, "The national committee will absorb the cost of distribution to the districts," you mean that that was decided but not carried out?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not carried out.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you not state on the stand this morning that seven-hundred-odd dollars might have been for that purpose?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; not for the cost of distribution but for payment for the books.

It might have been sent to him to pay us instead of sending it directly to us.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Again reading from this resolution:

\* \* \* Every copy of the book will represent a fixed price, from top to bottom, exactly the cost of printing and paper, and no more.

Now, what was that cost of printing and paper of this book?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. This resolution, you see, is not my resolution—the International Publishers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; of course, but what was the cost?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The cost of the book to us, all expenses, editorial, printing, and so on, amounts to about 22 cents to 23 cents. The cost of distribution will amount to another 4 cents or 5 cents. In other words, the production cost, say, of about 26 to 27 cents, all costs involved. We are charging for this book—the book is sold for 40 cents a copy, less a 20-percent discount. In other words, we hope to make a profit of about \$5,000 on the cost of production of this book.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then when this report stated "The cost of printing and paper and no more," and proceeded to say that that was 40 cents, that was an error, was it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That was an error. Forty cents is the retail price.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But you are selling to members at 40 cents?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right—the retail price.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But persons who buy the book in one of the Communist Party book stores get it for 40 cents?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. In the book stores?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, no; if they go to the book store, the regular trade book store, they pay \$1.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Have you sold more of these books at 40 cents than you have at \$1?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Then it is not true, as you stated a while ago, that the most of these books have been distributed through your book stores?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is true.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, you just said when they were distributed through book stores, they sell for a dollar, and you also stated just now, in answer to my question, that more were sold at 40 cents; therefore—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; the book-store distributors, when they come in to buy in the book stores, they are sold for \$1; but the workers' book shops buy in a large quantity, and at this time have sold about 92,000 copies. I think the New York Wholesale Book took 36,000 copies, and various book shops throughout the country took different quantities—6,000, 5,000—and for those books we charged 32 cents a copy, or 40 cents a copy less 20 percent discount, which makes 32 cents a copy, which gives us a larger profit. The usual book sold by us is 33 to 40 percent discount, and on this book we granted only 20 percent, and our profit, because of our quick turn-over and their buying in so large quantities at one time, we will have a profit then of about \$5,000 on this investment of about \$25,000—in other words, 20-percent profit.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, let me get this straight: You have sold more copies at 40 cents each than you have at \$1; is that correct?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Without regard to the manner of distribution, and only party members avail themselves of the 40-cent price?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. But they could get a copy or two for sympathizers, they had that right, if members themselves buy them?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not if I know it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This resolution so states.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. If they do it, they are not doing right by the International Publishers, because we want to sell our publication in the stores, because the biggest profit is there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This says:

\* \* \* Will be sold only to party and Young Communist League members in the branches at the special 40-cent price; they will, however, have the right to purchase more than one copy for sympathetic contacts and recruits for purposes of recruiting.

That is not doing right by you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not doing right by the International Publishers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. This is your own report, as you have identified it?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is not a report; it is a circular.

Mr. MATTHEWS. A special bulletin.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; a special bulletin.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, Mr. Trachtenberg, on page 5 of this document—I read:

The district committees to arrange special conferences to discuss distribution with fractions and commissions of the International Workers Order, workers' schools, Young Communist League, national groups, trade-unions, etc.

Was that agreed to by the literature commission?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Sure, in order to reach as many people as possible. It was a good book, and with 100,000 copies you have to do a good deal of promotion work in order to sell so large an edition.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I call your attention to the fact this document is published in January 1939, and Earl Browder testified under oath the other day that all fractions had been abolished of the Communist Party throughout the United States prior to the tenth convention of the party, which met in May 1938.

MR. TRACHTENBERG. That was correct.

MR. MATTHEWS. Why do you speak here of arranging with "fractions" of the I. W. O. in January 1939 if they had been abolished?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. Well, the people who wrote this thing were wrong.

MR. MATTHEWS. Who was responsible for the publishing of this document?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. The org-education commission.

MR. MATTHEWS. You know, Mr. Trachtenberg, that this is an issue of some moment, do you not—whether or not the Communist Party still maintains fractions in various organizations?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. Very important.

MR. MATTHEWS. Do you know of any action that has been taken on the basis of this language here, which you call an error?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. Well, it is a question of whoever prepared the thing as a bulletin just simply probably used the old language.

MR. MATTHEWS. The old language?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

MR. MATTHEWS. You still have the old reality, but you change the language?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. There is no old reality; there is a new reality. If it has been changed, it has been changed.

MR. MATTHEWS. As a matter of fact, it is true what the fractions used to do is done today, but under a different terminology, under different language!

MR. TRACHTENBERG. As a matter of fact, it is not correct, Mr. Matthews.

MR. MATTHEWS. That is not correct?

MR. TRACHTENBERG. No.

THE CHAIRMAN. How can you account for the use of that language here in January, if that is true?

MR. MATTHEWS. Yes; is it possible—

MR. TRACHTENBERG. You would be surprised how long a word in a language will persist after it is once used.

THE CHAIRMAN. I am not surprised; you are the one who is surprised.

MR. TRACHTENBERG. There are atavistic words in all languages at all times; there are atavistic words in all languages.

MR. WHITLEY. Perhaps you have to consider the context of the whole document, Mr. Chairman, in interpreting that word.

MR. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, this is only a five-page document, and I believe it is rather important to incorporate the entire document in the record. The importance attached by the party to the circulation, or distribution rather, of this history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is very well set forth here, together with all of the very many details of its distribution, including a statement that the district committees are to arrange with "fractions" of the International Workers Order and these other groups to bring about the distribution.

MR. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

(The paper above referred to will be found at the conclusion of the testimony of Mr. Trachtenberg.)

MR. MATTHEWS. Is it possible that someone has not been informed you have abolished "fractions" in the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; they are pretty well informed about that and pretty well instructed.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is just a slip of language?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes: and there are decisions for that purpose; but I would say, so far, we have not seen the result of sales of this book in the I. W. O., or any other organization you mention—so far. I wish we would.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What about "commissions of the I. W. O."? Is "commission" a new word for "fraction"?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not that I know of.

Mr. MATTHEWS. What do you mean by "commission"—

the district committees to arrange special conferences to discuss distribution with \* \* \* Commissions of the I. W. O., Workers Schools, Y. C. L., national groups, trade unions—

And so forth? What is a "commission"?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I don't know; it sounds unintelligible to me.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It sounds unintelligible to you?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes; it is unintelligible to me what they mean by "commissions."

Mr. MATTHEWS. Did you ever read this document prior to today?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. What year was it; what month?

Mr. MATTHEWS. January 1939; published by your department, "Special bulletin issued by the Org-Educational and Literature Commissions," of the latter of which you are head. Have you ever seen it before today?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I have seen it, but I don't think I have read the text of it completely, otherwise I certainly would have seen such words. They don't belong there. Probably the fellows who are working on the actual promotion of the book wrote it. I don't remember the words.

The CHAIRMAN. They wrote that contrary to instructions, did they not; that is not according to instructions?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Certainly not; if it was written by responsible people, it would not be written in the same language.

The CHAIRMAN. It was contrary to all instructions?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. There is no need for instructions. Any people involved in the promotion of certain books are simply left to themselves to write those things up and send them out. It is not a political document.

Mr. CASEY. You mean to say the use of the term "fractions," although "fractions" have been abolished, your explanation is it was merely a force of habit on the part of the organization?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. A force of habit. You know words synonymous to "fraction," "group," and so on—"committees"—are very often mixed up. There is no special significance.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me ask you this: This went out to all districts, branches, and sections of the Communist Party of the United States, did it not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes—districts.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And it went out 9 months ago?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. All the leading functionaries of the Communist Party throughout the United States have seen this, presumably?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Now, what did they do when they found this instruction to arrange meetings with "fractions"? Did not they write back to you, as the head of the literature commission and say "We have no fractions; how can we get together with them"?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. They would not write to me; they might protest to some other committee of the party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You have not heard about that?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Oh, they are not sticklers about words, as you are, Mr. Matthews—trying to read into it words which don't belong there.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am reading the word "fraction" just as it stands.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That has nothing to do with "fractions;" it has to do with the distribution of the book.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; through fractions.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Through members of the party.

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; through fractions.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Through members of the party in various organizations.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The language speaks for itself.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. There is a lot of language you would be surprised at.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I notice among the purposes set forth here for the unusual importance attached to the distribution of this book, is the following, addressed to members of the Communist Party of the United States:

The study of the history of the C. P. S. U. strengthens our confidence in the final victory of the great cause of the party of Lenin and Stalin, the victory of communism throughout the entire world.

That is what you aim to accomplish by your organization, the International Publishers, in effect, is it not?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is not issued by the International Publishers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am not saying it is; I asked—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. The international publishing organization is a firm that publishes books both of Communists and non-Communists.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You published this particular book?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And if it was not for that purpose, why would you be running the International Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. For what purpose?

Mr. MATTHEWS. If it is not for the purpose of seeing that the party of Lenin and Stalin and the victory of communism throughout the world—if that is not the purpose which animates the International Publishers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Me, personally; you mean me, personally, as head of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATTHEWS. And the International Publishers.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. As much as I can contribute to it; yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. There is no question about that; that is what the International Publishers exists for, as far as you are concerned?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Not necessarily, because we publish many books written by non-Communists.

Mr. CASEY. All the Communists have a common purpose?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. All the Communists have a common purpose, yes; but we have published books written by non-Communists—not

only fiction, but also scientific books; books by the best writers, such as Ivan Pavlov—books on philosophy; scientific books; books on medicine, music, art—not written by Communists, but written both by Communists and non-Communists.

Mr. WHITLEY. Do you ever publish a book that does not express a political philosophy in keeping with the political philosophy in keeping with the Communist theory?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. We have had a lot of books of that sort, I think; yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. You publish them because they are good sellers?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; sometimes because they are a progressive book—books on the exposition of some social question, published by people working in America.

Mr. WHITLEY. Any book you think might be a good book as a public seller—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. For educational purposes.

Mr. WHITLEY. For educational purposes?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is correct, and also will sell.

Mr. WHITLEY. You would not say the words "education" and "propaganda" are synonymous in Communist phraseology, would you, Mr. Trachtenberg?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. No; I would not. Of course, in common understanding, sometimes they are used together, but they are not the same.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Trachtenberg, you said you accepted, as a loyal Communist, the decision and thesis of the Seventh World Congress?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. That is right.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In addition to having participated in their circulation in this country?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I read you from the resolution of the Seventh World Congress, 1935, on the subject of war—

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I thought you had here Mr. Browder to interpret all the political questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, that is not a political question.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I am here for the International Publishers.

The CHAIRMAN. You are here to answer questions.

Mr. MATTHEWS. You said you accept this.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. It is all right with me.

Mr. MATTHEWS (reading):

Should a new imperialistic world war break out, despite all efforts of the working class to prevent it, the Communists will strive to lead the opponents of war, organized in the struggle for peace, to the struggle for the transformation of the imperialistic war into civil war against the Fascist instigators of war, against the bourgeoisie, for the overthrow of capitalism.

You subscribe to that, also, as a loyal member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. I already answered, before, my interpretation of this question that was put to me before.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Is the defense of the Soviet Union considered paramount, in the event of a new world war, by Communists?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. It is?

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHITLEY. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions, gentlemen? If not, the committee will meet in a brief executive session.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Marwig has analyzed the accounts of the International Publishers for a period of several years, but I do not believe there are any particular points to be brought out from that analysis at the present moment. So, if you prefer, we can wait until he presents a number of the other organizations at a later date, and then testify.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Are you through with this witness?

Mr. WHITLEY. As far as I am concerned; yes, sir.

Mr. BRODSKY. He is excused now to go?

The CHAIRMAN. He is excused.

Mr. BRODSKY. May I ask one favor of the chairman: I represent a number of witnesses here, and I should like very much to get a copy of your report.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the report?

Mr. BRODSKY. Of the Dies committee report.

The CHAIRMAN. When we have the report ready we will certainly give you a copy.

Mr. BRODSKY. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MASON. You mean a copy of the proceedings of the meetings?

Mr. BRODSKY. If you have any separate copies, well and good; but if I can have a copy of it all, I would appreciate it.

Mr. TRACHTENBERG. And, for myself, can I get a copy of the transcript of my testimony?

The CHAIRMAN. When it is published; yes.

(The committee thereupon went into executive session, at the conclusion of which a recess was taken until tomorrow, Thursday, September 14, 1939, at 10 a. m., at which time a further recess was taken until Friday, September 15, 1939, at 10 a. m.)

(The following was submitted for the record by Mr. Matthews:)

[Special bulletin issued by the org-educational and literature commissions of the national committee, Communist Party of the United States of America, January 1939]

#### THE HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION, PREPARED BY THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

"We accept full responsibility for the sale of 100,000 copies of The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and will use this, together with the whole campaign connected with the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the Communist International and our own party, as a means of raising the ideological level of our entire party membership."

Resolution adopted by national committee of the Communist Party, United States of America, December 1938.

This special bulletin is devoted entirely to the organization of the national campaign for the distribution of 100,000 copies of The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Please read these directives carefully and initiate discussions on them in all district, section, and branch committees.

#### COMRADE BROWDER'S MESSAGE TO THE PARTY ON THE "HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION," AT THE DECEMBER PLENUM OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Our great brother party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which gave to the world the supreme example of the Communist program translated into life, has also now provided us with a great instrument for our ideological rearmament. It is the new book, A Short Course in the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, prepared under the direction of its central

committee, with the personal participation and leadership of Comrade Stalin. We do not yet have the authentic English translation, but from what we have already learned of its character and of its role in the Soviet Union, where a first edition of 6,000,000 copies was sold in a few days, we know that it will be equal importance for us in America and for our brother parties of all lands.

Allow me to give you some idea of this supremely important book by a few quotations from its introduction. We read:

"The history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the history of three revolutions: The bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1905, the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917, and the Socialist revolution in October 1917.

"The history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the history of the overthrow of czarism, of the overthrow of the power of the landlords and capitalists, the history of the routing of the foreign armed intervention during the civil war, the history of the building up of the Soviet state and of Socialist society in our country."

What do we gain from the study of such a history? The introduction tells us:

"The study of the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union enriches us with the experience of the struggle of the workers and peasants of our country for socialism.

"The study of the history of struggle of our party against all the enemies of Marxism-Leninism, against all the enemies of the working people, assists us to master bolshevism, raises our political vigilance.

"The study of the heroic history of the Bolshevik Party arms us with the knowledge of the laws of social development and political struggle, with the knowledge of the driving forces of the revolution.

"The study of the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union strengthens our confidence in the final victory of the great cause of the party of Lenin and Stalin, the victory of communism throughout the entire world."

Will such a book be of special value also to us here in America, a book written and edited under the personal direction of our great teacher, Stalin? Of course, it will be of the most inestimable value.

I think you will all agree with this judgment without hesitation. And therefore I think you will also agree with the proposal which the political committee decided to place before you, that we make use of this book on a large scale, in a really organized manner, as a basic feature of our party's work and education.

We expect soon to have in our hands the authorized English translation, carefully checked and verified for accuracy by a commission of experts. We will be rushing it to the printer as soon as it is ready. We had to estimate how many copies of this book we need really to make use of it seriously. We recalled the fact that our party, together with the Young Communist League, has considerably more than 100,000 members. We therefore judge that we should print a minimum of 100,000 copies.

The history, although called "a short course," is not a small book, containing, as it does, some 450 pages. Such a book, in the usual course of publishing and distributing, would have to sell at a price of about \$3 per copy. Clearly, such a price would enormously increase the difficulties of distributing the number we consider necessary. We therefore turned our minds to the problem of eliminating every unnecessary expense and placing the book in the hands of every party member and close sympathizer at the physical cost of production, without any of the normal costs of distribution being added to the price. We decided that we would ask every branch of the party to order as many copies as they have members, plus as many copies as they think they can immediately sell to close sympathizers at the reduced price. The national committee will absorb the cost of distribution to the districts. The districts and sections will be asked to absorb the cost of distribution to the branches. The branches will distribute the book as a central political task of their members and sympathizers. Every copy of the book will represent a fixed price, from top to bottom, exactly the cost of printing and paper, and no more. Thus, with this special distribution, we will distribute the book through the party itself at a price of about 40 cents per copy instead of \$3. Copies to be distributed through the ordinary channels of book stores, and so on, will be sold at \$1 per copy.

That, briefly, is the plan which we submit for your approval. We think it is a practical one, within the powers of our party to fulfill completely and with dispatch. We hope you will agree with our judgment.

Once the book is in the hands of the readers, widely distributed, it will be a political task of the first magnitude to insure, in organized fashion, that it is

made the best possible use of. That requires study and discussion. This is no ordinary book to be skimmed through and then laid aside on a bookshelf. It is a scientific textbook to be studied and mastered, not a collection of dogmas to be memorized, nor for mechanical quotation of extracts, but to understand the essence of the theory of Marxism-Leninism so that it can be applied to the most varied and different problems and situations so that this theory can be enriched with the new experiences of the revolutionary working-class movement also of our country.

**HOW SHALL THE "HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION" BE SOLD AND DISTRIBUTED?**

1. The price per copy of the special edition of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union shall be 40 cents in the party and Young Communist League branches when purchased with the prepayment coupon card. This edition will be bound in hard board covers and will be sold only to party and Young Communist League members in the branches at the special 40-cent price; they will, however, have the right to purchase more than one copy for sympathetic contacts and recruits for purposes of recruiting. A cloth edition will be available for sale through the bookshops at \$1 per copy.

2. No district, section, or branch is authorized to alter the price set by the national committee for this book, nor to retain any margin of the moneys collected for it. The national committee has undertaken to stand the cost of distribution to the districts: the State committees within the districts, so as to pass on the book to the party membership at cost of production.

3. The national committee proposes the following quotas for the districts, based on the resolution adopted by the December plenum to distribute 100,000 copies of the English edition through the party and the Young Communist League.

New England-----	2,500	Colorado-----	350
New York-----	51,000	Texas-----	500
East Pennsylvania-----	3,500	Missouri-----	500
Kansas-----	300	West Virginia-----	150
West Pennsylvania-----	2,000	Kentucky-----	150
Ohio-----	4,500	Louisiana-----	150
Lower Michigan-----	3,000	Florida-----	350
Illinois-----	6,500	South Dakota-----	250
Minnesota-----	2,000	Upper Michigan-----	300
Nebraska-----	100	Indiana-----	500
North Dakota-----	150	Virginia-----	150
Washington-----	4,000	Montana-----	200
California-----	10,000	Oklahoma-----	250
North Jersey-----	2,000	Iowa-----	200
Connecticut-----	1,200	Tennessee-----	200
North Carolina-----	150	Maryland-----	1,500
Alabama-----	500	Utah-----	150
Wisconsin-----	1,750		

4. All orders shall be sent directly to the national committee.

5. All funds shall be handled through branch, section, and district finance departments, and shall be sent directly to the national committee.

6. All collections and payments shall be made in advance for books ordered, through issuance of prepayment coupon cards, of which sufficient copies will be sent to each district to reach the entire party membership. The prepayment-coupon card is designed to enable each party or Young Communist League member to purchase two copies of the book in installments of 10 cents. There are two coupons attached to each prepayment coupon card; each of the coupons is divided into four boxes, each box representing a 10-cent payment when dated and signed by the branch financial secretary. Thus, a fully paid-up coupon which represents four 10-cent payments, entitles a comrade to one copy; eight payments to two copies.

7. Payments should be made to the branch finance director, who will enter the payments in the regular branch receipt book, and will also indicate that payment has been made by dating and signing one of the boxes on the coupon for each 10-cent payment made.

8. The prepayment coupon card is designed to fit the membership book, and should be kept there. Additional cards should be given to any comrades who desire to purchase additional copies of the book.

9. The branch organizer of each branch shall in every case give leadership in organizing the sale and distribution of the book, although the branch finance secretary should handle the funds and the books.

PLAN OF PROMOTION OF HISTORY OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF SOVIET UNION

1. The national committee will launch a national prize essay contest on the Significance of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for American Workers. The winning essay will be printed in the Communist. The winner will be invited to attend the next plenum of the national committee.

2. Each district committee to submit its plans to the national committee for the popularization, study, and distribution of the book.

3. At least one large mass meeting should be organized in each district, at which a party leader will lecture on the significance of this book.

4. This special bulletin is being sent to the districts in sufficient quantities so that each branch of the party receives a copy. The branch organizer is to present the plans incorporated in this bulletin to his members.

5. The district committees to arrange special conferences to discuss distribution with fractions and commissions of the International Workers Order, workers' schools, Young Communist League, national groups, trade unions, etc.

6. The national org-educational commission is preparing plans and outlines for study of the book throughout the party.

7. A poster is being designed by a leading artist for national distribution. Also a circular and other material.

8. Each district to issue its own leaflets or circulars, in addition to literature bulletins. The best leaflet will earn a copy of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, signed by Comrade Foster.

9. Every book store to organize a special window display around the book. Photos of the display should be sent to the national committee. The winning display will get a copy of The People's Front, signed by Comrade Browder; The Negro and the Democratic Front, signed by Comrade Ford; and From Bryan to Stalin, signed by Comrade Foster.

10. The national committee will designate special writers to each of the three newspapers, the Daily Worker, People's World, and Daily Record, to publicize the book.

11. Outstanding party leaders will contribute articles on the book, to appear in the English and language press.

12. A campaign to be initiated in every district and section to request the book in the public libraries to guarantee that the libraries will make it available.

13. The study of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to be linked up throughout the anniversary year of 1939 with the study of other basic Marxist-Leninist theoretical works, with American history, with the counter-revolutionary role of Trotskyism-Lovestoneism, with the achievements of the Soviet Union, etc.

14. A banner to be awarded by the national committee to the district surpassing its quota by the highest margin.

X











BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 2477

APR 2 9 1944

